

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.
For the present The QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
The REVIEW in four numbers in March, June, September, and December.

AUG 23 1940

The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
P

Editors { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.,
PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A., F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.), } Representing the Council of the
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. } Classical Association
E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of
PROF. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland, PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF. B. D. MERITT,
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume LIV

JUNE 1940

Number 2

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	65
TWO NOTES ON THE ATHENIAN TRIBUTE-LISTS. A. W. GOMME	65
GREEK TIME-KEEPING. J. E. POWELL	69
THE DELIVERY OF CANTICA ON THE ROMAN STAGE. W. BEARE	70
LUCRETI POEMATATA AND THE POET'S DEATH. F. H. SANDBACH	72
PUNCTUM. W. L. LORIMER	77
ARISTOPHANES, <i>BIRDS</i> , 1122. H. J. ROSE	79
REVIEWS:	
<i>Greek Tragedy</i> (Kitto), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 79; <i>Aeschylus</i> (Murray), H. D. F. KITTO, 81; <i>The Agamemnon of Aeschylus translated into English verse</i> (Campbell), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 82; <i>Euripides, Ion</i> (Owen), D. S. ROBERTSON, 84; <i>Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede</i> (Weber), K. J. MAIDMENT, 85; <i>Isocrate</i> , II (Mathieu et Brémont), K. J. MAIDMENT, 86; <i>Plato</i> (Leon), D. TARRANT, 87; <i>Aristotelian Papers</i> (Cooper), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 88; <i>Cicero, Brutus and Orator</i> (Hendrick- son and Hubbell), R. G. NISBET, 89; <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis De Domo Sua</i> (Nisbet), E. C. WOODCOCK, 91; <i>Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain</i> (McPeck), D. W. LUCAS, 93; <i>Accentual Symmetry in Vergil</i> (Knight), O. SKUTSCH, 93; <i>M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber I</i> (Getty), C. J. FORDYCE, 95; <i>Claudians</i> <i>Festgedicht auf das sechste Konsulat des Kaisers Honorius</i> (Müller), W. H. SEMPLE, 98; <i>Greek and Latin</i> (Crawford), J. W. PIRIE, 100; <i>Griechische Grammatik</i> , II (Schwyzer), L. R. PALMER, 101; <i>L'aspect verbal et</i> <i>l'emploi des préverbes en grec</i> (Brunel), P. B. R. FORBES, 102; <i>MSS. 27 and 107 of the Municipal Library of</i> <i>Autun</i> (Robinson), E. H. MINNS, 103; <i>Ariadne</i> (Meerdink), H. J. ROSE, 104; <i>Les Chefs-d'Œuvre de la Peinture</i> <i>grecque</i> (Méautis), M. ROBERTSON, 104; <i>Politics, Finance and Consequences</i> (Bullock), W. J. SARTAIN, 105; <i>Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum</i> (Bolkestein), R. MEIGGS, 106; <i>An Economic</i> <i>Survey of Ancient Rome</i> , IV (Frank), M. P. CHARLESWORTH, 107; <i>The Romans in Britain</i> (Moore), E. HARRISON, 109; <i>La Vie des Romains: La Vie publique</i> (Laguerre), H. MATTINGLY, 110; <i>Some Class-books</i> , D. S. COLMAN, 111.	
SHORT REVIEWS	112
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	118
BOOKS RECEIVED	119

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : HUMPHREY MILFORD

Price for single numbers, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton, and West Somerset.

T

THE
Clas
Jan
due
Hal
field
prog
to t
very
hav
stan
Gas
lige
hist
clas
to-o
J. I
stru
mai
was
the
ear
he
shie
wit
wer
poe
add
tion
pre
ma
wa
civ

I.
IN
W
bu
193
vie
ori
tha
(B
dra
clu

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

JUNE 1940

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Annual General Meeting of the Classical Association, postponed from January, when a London meeting was due, was held at Oxford, at St. Peter's Hall (the war-time residence of Westfield College), from April 11 to 13. A programme of four lectures in addition to the Presidential Address attracted a very much larger audience than might have been expected in present circumstances. The President, Sir Stephen Gaselee, devoted his Address, 'An Intelligence Service for the Classics', to an historical survey of that branch of classical studies which is represented to-day by *The Year's Work*. Professor J. L. Myres, offering an ingenious reconstruction of Hesiod's *Shield of Heracles*, maintained that the poet's description was based on real shields and suggested the technique of extant examples of early Greek and Oriental metal-work: he would rather seek a date for the shield by comparison with these than with painted vases, the motifs of which were more probably borrowed from the poet. Dr. Gilbert Murray's inspiring address, 'Humane Letters and Civilization', reminded us that great literature preserved the highest experiences of mankind: to read ancient masterpieces was to relive great moments of a past civilization and so to 'understand the

achievement of Athens and Rome in the eternal pilgrimage of Man towards τὸ εὖ ζῆν'. Professor W. B. Anderson, in a paper on 'Virgil and his Critics', vindicated the character of Aeneas against those interpreters who ignored the true significance for a Roman of the epithet *pius*. Miss J. M. C. Toynbee's lecture on 'New Side-lights on Imperial Art from Rome and Ostia' was greatly enjoyed for the beautiful illustrations of newly discovered sculpture, painting, and mosaic, and for her expert commentary on their significance in the history of Roman art. The lectures were all given in the Ashmolean Museum.

The Vice-Chancellor held an Afternoon Reception at Magdalen, and the Annual Dinner took place at Christ Church.

At the Business Meeting the following elections were made: President: Sir R. W. Livingstone; new Vice-Presidents: Sir Stephen Gaselee, Miss J. R. Bacon, Mr. H. Ramsbotham; Secretaries: Mr. J. J. R. Bridge and Miss N. C. Jolliffe (re-elected); Treasurer: Miss E. C. Gedge (re-elected). Votes of thanks were passed to the Vice-Chancellor, the Governors and Principal of Westfield College, the Dean and Students of Christ Church, and the Visitors of the Ashmolean Museum.

TWO NOTES ON THE ATHENIAN TRIBUTE LISTS

1. *The Missing Year.*

In the magnificent volume by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor on the Tribute Lists (Harvard University Press, 1939) the authors accept Wade-Gery's view that one year's list is, and was originally, missing from the record, and that this year was the sixth, 449-8 (*B.S.A.* xxxiii, 1932-3, 101-13); and draw the at first sight natural conclusion that no tribute was collected

for that year. I do not believe that that conclusion is necessary; and if it is not necessary, it is probably wrong.

First two epigraphical questions, which I put very tentatively. I am doubtful about the year. On the *lapis primus* the first five lists (454-3 to 450-49) are on the obverse face of the stone (the first two extending over the right lateral face as well) and are numbered. The next (*I.G.* i.² 196 = *S.E.G.* v,

Titulus 6) follows the fifth below it, but is dated only by the secretary's name (*Μενέρ[ιμ]ος*), not numbered; its last line approaches the bottom of the stone, and there is an uninscribed space below it, but the original height of the space below it is unknown. Then on the right lateral face, immediately below the right-hand columns of year 2, comes *I.G.* i.² 198 = *S.E.G. Tit.* 8; this was numbered, but the number is lost:

ἐπὶ τῆς ἀ[. . .

ἡεὶ Διόδ[. . .

[II]αονί[δες

The thickness of the stone being known, the number of letters can be calculated—20 to 22. Because the secretary's name was thought to be necessarily Diodotos or Diodoros, the number was given as 22 (*ἡεὶ Διόδ[. . . ἑξαμμάτευε*), and the first line in consequence read as ἐπὶ τῆς ἀ[ρχῆς τῆς ἡεβδόμης] or [ὀγδόης *v v*]. Meritt now argues (*Doc. Ath. Trib.* 1937, 66-9) that there were only 20 letters in the line, and restores ὀγδόες, and Διόδες for the secretary's name, a rarity which occurs once elsewhere;¹ and this is accepted in the new volume. But the *stoichedon* arrangement is not perfect, and I am not convinced that this is certain; the greater probability of Διόδωπος or Διόδοτος weighs something against it. Since *Tit.* 6 (*Mene-timos'* year) is almost certainly the immediate predecessor of *Tit.* 8 (Meritt, *ibid.* 65-6), and year 9 follows (on the reverse face), *tituli* 6 and 8 may be the records for years 6 and 7 and not for years 7 and 8; if they are, then 447-6 (year 8) and not 449-8 is the missing year. This would obviously make a considerable difference to the historical interpretation.

My other doubt arises from the fact that the record for year 9 does not begin at the top of the stone. The top of the reverse face is lost, but there is space for 11 lines (perhaps one or two more),²

¹ *I.G.* i.² 372.2. Probably Διόδης, formed like **Ἡρώδης*, not Διόδης or Διόδης (so *v.* Hiller, and Wade-Gery in a letter).

² A rough calculation from the facsimile drawing in *Athenian Tribute Lists*, pl. 9. See Wade-Gery, *l.c.* pp. 102-4 and Meritt, *A.J.A.* xxxiii, 1929, pp. 379-81, for the relative position of year 9 on the stone; it is not fixed within a line or two.

i.e. about $\frac{1}{3}$ of a year's record—the ninth year occupies 33 lines. Since on the other three faces of the *lapis primus*, and on the two faces preserved of the *lapis secundus* (and, with practical certainty, on the other two as well), the inscribed lines begin at the top, the obvious inference is that this space was occupied by the last part of year 8. It would follow from this not only that we must read ἡεβδόμης in *tit.* 8, but that the record for year 8 was begun at the bottom of the obverse face; and from this again that the order of the records was disturbed (year 6 on the obverse, 7 on the right lateral, 8 on the obverse again at the bottom and continued on the reverse) and that there was a wider uninscribed space between the records of year 6 and year 8 than between any other two years on the obverse. These are serious objections (though the spacing between the years on this face is very irregular); but perhaps not more serious than that to the uninscribed space above year 9 on the reverse, which is at present assumed.¹ The difficulty of this uninscribed space must at least be considered before we can be confident that a year's record is missing.

Let us suppose, however, that this confidence is justified (that it will be one day confirmed): does it follow that the tribute for that year (whether 449-8 or 447-6) was never collected? There are strong *a priori* arguments against it. First, we should have expected some record of it. Not much weight should be allowed to this, for Perikles' proposal for a Panhellenic Congress is only preserved in Plutarch, and the Peace of Kallias is only implied, not recorded, by Thucydides (viii. 56. 4), and recorded, generally inaccurately, only in the fourth century; but it is something. Secondly, it would have been a remark-

¹ There is of course this further possibility: that the whole of the record of year 8 was at the top of the reverse face, occupying only 9 or 10 lines if we allow for the prescript; which would mean that not more than one-third of the cities paid tribute in 447-6, after the Athenian defeat in Boeotia. (Compare the old short list of year 7, as given in *I.G.* i.² and *S.E.G.* v, before Wade-Gery's discovery that the records of years 1 and 2 extended over the right lateral face of the stone.)

able *volte-face* in Athenian policy, and at a moment when Athens was singularly victorious (at least if the year was 449-8). It must be remembered that Perikles' political opponents had been as keen imperialists as he had been, that Kimon, for example, had added some tribute-paying cities to the League by his Eurymedon campaign, and had reduced Thasos to subjection; nor do we hear, even in the later tradition that made him in every way so different from Perikles, that he opposed the transference of the treasury of the League from Delos to Athens. There is no reason to suppose that his successor as leader of the conservatives, the son of Melesias, had different views, even though his factious opposition to Perikles led him to champion the subject states in some minor matters; even in 411, the extremists among the oligarchs still wanted to preserve the empire if possible (Thuc. viii. 63. 4, 91. 3). Thirdly, how was the fleet maintained for that year? and how was Athens able, after loosening her grip so decisively, to resume her sway, so smoothly and so successfully, in the following year, collecting just as much tribute from just as many states (especially if the year was 447-6, so soon after her defeat in Boeotia and in the midst of other difficulties)?

These considerations make the historian doubt the epigraphists' conclusions; and there is another possible explanation. Our records are of the quota paid to Athena, not of the whole tribute; it was this quota, paid to the goddess of Athens, placed in her treasury, that more than anything else symbolized the subjection of the allies to Athens. From this quota, amounting to some sixty to seventy talents yearly, were paid out sums for the Parthenon and the rest of the 'adornment' of the city. We know that Thucydides son of Melesias violently opposed this policy. It is possible that in 449-8 he was successful in carrying one measure through the *ekklesia*, namely, that no quota should be paid from the tribute to Athena; and that this was reversed the next year. Such a measure would be consistent with the preservation of

the League, which the conservatives of Athens supported as much as the democrats, implies no sudden break in Athenian policy, and would lead to no difficulties in the collection of the tribute and the taking of the quota for Athena in the following year; and it is consistent with the absence of the quota-list for one year from the record—if that absence is confirmed.

2. Πόλεις αὐταὶ φόρον ταχσάμεναι.

This rubric occurs only in the sixth assessment period (434/3-431/0), that is, in the years 21, 22, and 23, no fragment of the record for year 24 (431/0) being at present known. Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, p. 456, follow E. B. Couch, *A.J.A.* xxxiii, 1929, 502-14, in interpreting it as 'cities assessed separately'; Mrs. Couch regards it as a form of *ἀπόταξις*, separating these small communities from their larger neighbours, Spartolos, Olynthos, or Samos, and as a punitive measure adopted by Athens. This is not possible: the middle voice cannot be equivalent to the passive. Mrs. Couch says it can (p. 513): 'it seems that a Greek writer of the fifth century [unlike Plutarch, *Aristeides* 24. 1] regularly expressed the idea contained in the prescript in terms of the middle voice, for while Thucydides uses the active and passive of *τάττω* in connexion with the assessment of the tribute (*φόρος*: i. 96. 2, iii. 50. 2, *φόρον μὲν οὐκ ἔταξαν Λεσβίοις*; cf. also Ps.-Andok. iv. 11),¹ he invariably uses the middle in connexion with the assessment of a people. The examples that follow from Thucydides, moreover, preclude any idea of voluntary contribution. After the revolt of Thasos *Θάσιοι . . . ὠμολόγησαν Ἀθηναίοις τεῖχος τε καθελόντες καὶ ναῦς παραδόντες, χρήματά τε ὅσα ἔδει ἀποδοῦναι αὐτίκα ταχάμενοι καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν φέρειν* (i. 101. 3). So too i. 108. 4 (Aigina), 117. 3 (Samos), iii. 50. 2 (*Λέσβιοι ταχάμενοι τοῦ κλήρου ἑκάστων τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ δύο μνᾶς φέρειν*); and cf. iii. 70. 5. But this distinction between the use of *τάττειν* with *φόρος* and that with *πόλις* is an

¹ We may add that they are (of course) used officially in the assessment decree of 425 B.C., *I.G.* i². 63.

idle one. The active is *φόρον πόλει τάττουσι*, the passive *φόρος πόλει τάττεται*; and in all the cases where the middle is used it is because the amount to be paid is reached by agreement, by a treaty; not 'the Thasians were assessed at so much', but 'agreed to pay so much' (especially iii. 70. 5: the oligarchs of Kerkyra, heavily fined, take refuge at an altar *διὰ πλῆθος τῆς ζημίας, ὅπως ταξάμενοι ἀποδώσω*—to find some way, by agreement with the victorious democrats, of paying the fine, in instalments or the like). The fact that the agreement was reached by *force majeure*, that it was practically dictated (though not quite: Thasos, Aigina, Samos, and Mytilene did not surrender unconditionally), does not alter this; it only gives the circumstances leading to the agreement. For suppose that Samos after the democratic revolution and close alliance with Athens in 411 had agreed to pay a regular money contribution for the upkeep of the fleet: that would equally have been expressed by *ἀργύριον ἐτάξαντο φέρειν*; and if they had suggested it themselves, on their own initiative, *αὐτοί* would have been added, as on the rubric.

Mrs. Couch thinks that we know the circumstances in which the cities in this rubric reached the agreement to pay, and that, in practice at any rate, it was forced on them by Athens. But we do not know this. The eleven cities listed under the rubric were all small places, seven of them in the Thracian district (all probably in Chalkidike), three island-states (Amorgos, Kasos, and Eteokarpathos) and the obscure Kallipolitai probably on the south-east coast of the Propontis (see the Gazetteer in *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, s.v.). Of the seven in Chalkidike, six paid no tribute in 432-1 and 430-29, and four of these probably none in 429-8—obviously they took part in the secession from the League in 432. But this does not mean that we know the circumstances in which they came to pay tribute in 434-3.¹ It may have been due to the

presence of an Athenian armed force—a 'dictated' agreement—or to the suggestion of an Athenian official offering advantages in return—a 'negotiated' agreement—or have been on their own initiative, to escape from the domination of a more powerful neighbour; perhaps indeed as the result of a revolution in their own small communities. If it was on their own initiative (as *αὐταί* in the rubric suggests), their participation in the revolt of 432 must have been due to pressure from Olynthos and Spartolos (and perhaps to a counter-revolution). This is likely enough: the idea that Athens alone could or would exercise pressure is untenable. We are not to suppose that there was no opposition in Mekyberna to the union with Olynthos; we know that in the fourth century Chalkidic union against Sparta and later against Philip was not complete. Greek particularism was almost infinitely divisible.

I am not denying that the appearance of nine of these eleven states for the first time in 434-3 is probably due to *ἀπόταξις*—that they are fragments split off from some larger unit;² nor do I think these form a specially privileged group. I only assert that their disappearance in 432-1 is as likely to be due to pressure from Olynthos as their appearance in 434-3 to pressure from Athens; and that *αὐταί φόρον ταξάμεναι* means what it says.

A word about another rubric. Three of the eleven (Sartaioi on the Sithonian peninsula, Kallipolitai and Amorgos)

(except that Chedrolioi did not pay in 443-2). Both of these appear as *ἀτακτοί* (Chedrolioi by a probable restoration) in 435-4. The reason for the new method of assessment (or for the new formula in the lists) in these two cases is quite obscure, and is certainly not explicable on the *ἀπόταξις* theory. It may be noted that Pharbelioi in 434/3, when they 'themselves assessed the phoros', paid half as much as they had been paying (8½ dr. quota instead of 16½), Chedrolioi twice as much (16½ dr. instead of 8½ dr.); these are little things it is idle to try to explain.

One of these small states, Pleumes, avoided payment in 433/2 as well. We do not know the reason for that either.

² At the same time, note that five years elapsed between the war with Samos and the *ἀπόταξις* of Amorgos.

¹ Five of the seven appear in the lists for the first time in 434-3; two, Pharbelioi and Chedrolioi, had apparently been paying regularly since 454

reappear in 430-29 and 429-8, and three more (Aiolitai, probably near Spartolos, Pleumes, perhaps near it, and Kasos) in 429-8, under a new rubric: *ταῖςδε ἔταξαν οἱ τάκται ἐπὶ Κρ[.]ο γραμματέωντος*. Meritt and his colleagues (p. 456) think that Kr. was secretary to the *τάκται* in 434-3 and that the meaning of this and the former rubric is essentially the same. Clearly not. If they had been assessed by the regular *τάκται* in 434-3 (a new assessment year, according to Meritt), they would have needed no special rubric—they would have appeared in the general list. The assess-

sors to whom Kr. was secretary must have been a special board, probably of the previous year, who officially adopted the assessments originally proposed by the states themselves—what is the value of words if *οἱ τάκται ἔταξαν αὐτοῖς* is to mean the same as *αὐτοὶ ἐτάξαντο*?

These two problems are excellent examples of the difficulties in interpreting events when we only have official records; which does not mean that the attempt should not be made.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

GREEK TIMEKEEPING

THE Greek terms for a sun-dial or its parts are *πόλος* and *γνώμων*. Except for a certain sentence in Herodotus, *πόλος* occurs first in this sense in Lucian,¹ and *γνώμων* in Philodemus. *Ἡλιοτρόπιον*, *ὥρολόγιον*, and *σκιόθρονον* with its derivatives are not mentioned before Strabo. Use of a sun-dial implies division of the day into hours. Except for the same passage of Herodotus, no such division of the day is found before Plutarch.² The classical Greeks, therefore, if they possessed sun-dials, neither mentioned them nor used them, which is very strange.

The word *στοιχεῖον* is, however, classical. In Ar. *Eccl.* 652 Blepyrus, freed from the cares of his farm, will need only to think of going to dine *ὅταν ᾖ δεκάπουν*

τὸ στοιχεῖον, and similarly Eubulus, *ap. Athen.* 1, 8, has an invitation to dine *ὅπηνικ' ἂν | εἴκοσι ποδῶν σκοποῦντι τὸ στοιχεῖον ᾗ*. Compare Menander, *ap. eundem* 6. 243, *κληθεῖς | εἰς ἐστίασιν δεκάποδος*, and Hesychius and Suidas, s.vv. *ἐπτάπους* and *δεκάπους σκιά*; also Pollux 6. 44 *τῇ σκιά ἐτεκμαίροντο τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπὶ δείπνον ὁδοῦ, ἣν καὶ στοιχεῖον ἐκάλουν· καὶ ἔδει σπεύδειν, εἰ δεκάπουν τὸ στοιχεῖον εἶη*. But *στοιχεῖον* is the shadow not of the gnomon, as L. and S. have it, but of the man himself (Diels, *Antike Technik*, 159). It would be an inconvenient sun-dial on which the time was read from shadows ten or twenty feet long.

There remain only one or two late passages referring to sun-dials in classical times: Diog. L. 2, 1 = Suidas, s.v. *γνώμων*, *εὔρε (sc. Ἀναξίμανδρος) καὶ γνώμονα πρῶτος καὶ ἔστησεν ἐπὶ τῶν σκιοθήρων ἐν Λακεδαίμονι*, and schol. Ar. *Av.* 997 *φησὶ δὲ Καλλίστρατος ἐν Κολωνῷ ἀνάθημά τι εἶναι αὐτοῦ (sc. Μέτωνος) ἀστρολογικόν . . . ὁ δὲ Φιλόχορος ἐν Κολωνῷ μὲν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν θεῖναι λέγει, ἐπὶ Ἀψευδοῦς δὲ τοῦ πρὸ Πυθοδώρου ἡλιοτρόπιον ἐν τῇ νῦν οὐσῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρὸς τῷ τείχει τῷ ἐν τῇ Πνυκί. μήποτε οὖν τὸ χωρίον, φασὶ τινες, ἐκεῖνο πᾶν ᾧ περιλαμβάνεται καὶ ἡ Πνύξ, Κολωνός ἐστιν*; On the other hand, Vitruvius (9. 9. 1) mentions as the earliest inventor of a sun-dial Berosus the Chaldaean, of the third century B.C.

In these circumstances it would be

¹ Ar. *fr.* 163 = 210 = Pollux 9. 46 *τῶν δὲ πόλεως μερῶν . . . τὸ δὲ καλούμενον ὥρολόγιον ᾗ πού πόλον ἂν τις εἴποι, φήσαντος Ἀριστοφάνους ἐν Γηρυτάδῃ· πόλος τοῦτ' ἐστίν; ἕκαστα πόστην ἡλῖος τέτραπται*; is unintelligible, and doubtless corrupt. There is not sufficient context to show that *πόλος* does not mean the heavenly vault, as in *Av.* 179 f.

² A scholiast on K 252 *παρώχωνεν δὲ πλέων νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, τριτάτῃ δ' ἐτι μοῖρα λείπεται*, cites Aristotle (*fr.* 156 Rose) for the explanation that the *δύο μοῖραι* are the two halves of the night and the *τριτάτῃ μοῖρα* the last third. In expanding this, he continues *ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δώδεκα μοῖραι (ῥάραι) εἰς δύο ἰσας μερίδας μερίζεσθαι δύνανται, εἰς ἕξ, ἡμέρη δὲ καὶ πλεον γηγονός (ῥέγονε) θάτερον μέρος, ἀθλον δὲ πόσαις ὥραις, . . . ἀφορίας ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον τοῦ πλεόνος πόσον ᾖν καὶ ὅτι δύο ὥραις ἡμέρη, ἐπάγαγεν ὅτι τρίτῃ μοῖρα λείπεται*. But there is nothing to show how far in the scholium Aristotle's own explanation, let alone his own language, extends.

surprising if Herodotus had really referred to the πόλος and γνώμων and 'the twelve parts of the day' as familiar institutions in the Greece of his time. After mention of the surveying necessitated in Egypt by alterations which the Nile flood caused, his text continues (2. 109. 3): δοκεί μοι ἐνθεῦτεν γεωμετρίῃ εὐρεθεῖσα ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα [ἐπαν]ελθεῖν. πόλον μὲν γὰρ καὶ γνώμονα καὶ τὰ δώδεκα μέρεα τῆς ἡμέρης παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων ἔμαθον οἱ Ἕλληνες. Βασιλεὺς μὲν δὴ οὗτος μῦθος Αἰγύπτους Αἰθιοπίας ἤρξε, κτλ. The sentence πόλον . . . Ἕλληνες, which conflicts with our other evidence about Greek timekeeping, comes in here apropos of nothing. It was, I believe, interpolated by someone not earlier than Alexandrine times who shared the opinion of Vitruvius.

He might have found better particles to introduce his interpolation than μὲν γάρ.

The sentence has bulked very largely in discussions of Greek chronology. But for it, the almost complete lack of evidence for sun-dials, let alone a twelve-hour day, in the classical period must long ago have attracted attention. Even if it were no more than possible that the sentence is interpolated, those discussions would stand in need of much modification. The interpolation, if such it is, will take its place worthily in a series of learned Alexandrine interpolations in Herodotus, some at least of which, such as 1. 143. 3, 3. 131. 3, 5. 9. 3, and 6. 122, have already been recognized.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

University of Sydney.

THE DELIVERY OF *CANTICA* ON THE ROMAN STAGE

IN his review of Roman dramatic origins (vii. 2) Livy includes an anecdote (*dicitur*) about Livius Andronicus. According to the story Andronicus, finding that his voice was failing, employed a boy to sing the words of the *cantica* while he himself accompanied the song with appropriate gestures. Livy adds that this practice became general, so that actors after Andronicus' time used their voices in the spoken scenes (*diuerbia*) only, contenting themselves with dumb show in the sung parts of the play, which were, presumably, rendered by vocalists who had nothing to do with the acting. Valerius Maximus (ii. 4) repeats the story with regard to Andronicus, but says nothing about the methods employed by actors of a later day.

Apart from the general question of the accuracy of the anecdote, there are two points of interpretation: in what sense does Livy use the word *canticum*, and does he mean that the division between the roles of actor and singer held good for the whole history of Roman drama down to his own day? Tenney Frank (*Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, p. 35) thinks that the innovation was merely temporary; Ribbeck (*Gesch. der röm. Dichtung*, i.

195) accepts the story for most of the Republican period, including the lifetime of Accius, but thinks that by Cicero's time the actor himself sang the *cantica*, at least on occasion; Lejay believes that Livy is describing the practice as it existed in his own day, and that this very fact guarantees the truth of the story; Boissier (Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. *canticum*) thinks that Livy's account is certainly true so far as the late Republic is concerned, and that the division between actor and singer very probably does go back to early times. Voltaire rejected the story altogether ('la chose aurait été aussi ridicule qu'impraticable'). As for the *cantica*, does the word here bear its usual (I believe its invariable) sense, including all scenes or parts of scenes uttered to musical accompaniment, or does it convey some narrower meaning? What, in fact, were the '*cantica* proper' of which modern writers speak? Lejay says that tragedy and comedy contained 'long portions in song'; Magnin (*Les Origines du Théâtre*, p. 331) tells us that 'ces morceaux lyriques ou *cantica* étaient peu nombreux'. All modern writers assert that there were three recognized methods of utterance on the Roman stage—speech, song, and recita-

tive to musical accompaniment. This assertion is supposed to hold good for the Greek theatre also (except that some try to distinguish further between *καταλογή* and *παρακαταλογή*), and attempts are made to argue from Greek to Roman usage and vice versa. So far as Roman usage is concerned, the evidence for a recognized tripartite division does not exist. The scene-headings in the manuscripts of Plautus know only the distinction between DV (*diuerbium*) and C (*canticum*); DV is placed above scenes in iambic *senarii*, C above every other type; the two (possibly three) cases where DV occurs at the head of scenes in trochaic *septenarii* may be mere slips. The grammarians recognize only these two kinds of utterance (apart from choral delivery), and though Diomedes tries in one passage to define *cantica* as monodies, his definition seems to be based on artificial principles, and he elsewhere tells us that Latin comedies, since they have no chorus, consist entirely of two elements, *diuerbium* and *canticum*. There were, no doubt, several varieties of utterance ranging from plain speech to full song; but the only recognized distinction appears to have been between utterance with and utterance without musical accompaniment. In the former category came every sort of metre except iambic *senarii*; the best proof of this is the change from *septenarii* to *senarii* in *Stichus* 761-2, when the flute-player is drinking. The idea of a recognized tripartite division seems to go no further back than Ritschl, and the only 'certain' instance of the use of *cantica* in the 'proper' sense which Reisch (P.W., s.v. *canticum*) puts forward is the very passage of Livy which we are discussing!

Undoubtedly Livy is asserting that for at least a period in the history of Latin drama the roles of actor and singer were separated: at certain moments in the performance the actors became silent, while the words supposed to be sung by them were really uttered by vocalists who stepped for the purpose in front of the flute-player. The French writers cite modern parallels. We have all seen an actor go

through the motions of playing the piano while the music is supplied by an unseen instrumentalist. We read of an occasion when, for lack of trained theatrical choruses, untrained actors performed in dumb show on the stage while 'des musiciens, qui ne pouvaient ou ne voulaient pas paraître en public, chantaient dans les coulisses'. The closest parallel Lejay can find is the innovation of 'le sieur La Grille', who in 1874 staged operas in which the action was performed by 'une grande marionnette', while the song was entrusted to 'un musicien dont la voix sortait par une ouverture ménagée dans le plancher de la scène'. All these supposed parallels have one fatal weakness: they refer to singers or instrumentalists who are not visible to the audience, while Livy makes Andronicus bring his vocalist on the stage, where he stands right in front of the flute-player. Whether one vocalist was shared by all the actors or each actor was represented by a different vocalist, the result would have been highly confusing to the audience. The last scenes of the *Stichus* show three actors on the stage; the metre is sometimes iambic *senarii*, sometimes trochaic *septenarii*, sometimes *octonarii* or *uersus reiziani* (all occur within the last ten lines of the play). One actor gives the flute-player a drink; while he is drinking the music naturally stops, and accordingly the metre changes from *septenarii* to *senarii*. The actors ask him for a dance-tune; he obliges them with one, and they sing as they dance:

SA. fac tu hoc modo. STI. at tu hoc modo.
SA. babae! STI. tatae! SA. papae! STI. pax!

To suppose a distinction between actors and singers would render such scenes unstageable.

There is no parallel to Andronicus' innovation in Greek dramatic practice. There is no other reference to such a practice in the performance of Roman drama. In the time of Terence we find Ambivius Turpio complaining that at his age he finds almost intolerable the strain on his voice of such parts as the *seruus currens*. Cicero (*Tusc.* i. 106-7),

speaking of the famous *canticum* in the *Iliona* of Pacuvius:

mater, te appello, tu, quae curam somno suspensam leuas,

says that the actor utters these words to the sound of the *tibia*. He quotes the words uttered by the actor Aesopus in the *Eurysaces* of Accius; they include not only *septenarii* but

haec omnia uidi inflammari

(*pro Sest.* 120). In two passages (*de Orat.* i. 254, *de Leg.* i. 11) he refers to Roscius as singing more slowly in old age. There are works of art which show not only the actors but the flute-player (e.g. the comedy-relief in Naples); nowhere is there any indication of a non-acting vocalist. The attempt to oppose the terms *cantor* and *actor* is futile; Plautus (*Ps.* 366) uses *cantor* of actors on the stage, speaking in *septenarii*, and Horace (*A.P.* 155) tells us that the final *uos plaudite* was uttered by a *cantor*, i.e. an actor, for we find in Plautus that the parting valediction is assigned to one of the characters and is almost always in trochaic *septenarii*.

It has long been recognized that

Livy's story may have some connexion with the pantomime. Boissier thought that the pantomime owed its origin to the (alleged) Roman custom of dividing the actors from the singers and, later, of having the *cantica* sung without their context. But the pantomime had its own libretto, written by such people as Lucan and Statius; I know no grounds for supposing that it originated in the manner imagined by Boissier. It seems more probable that we should find in the existence of the pantomime in Livy's day the origin of the story about Andronicus, or, at least, that part of the story which refers to the effect of his infirmity on Roman stage practice. Later ages ascribed to Andronicus the origin not only of tragedy and comedy but even of the *togata*, and Livy, as he himself makes clear, has little interest in the history of the Roman drama except to illustrate his main theme—*quam ab sano initio res in hanc uix opulentis regnis tolerabilem insaniam uenerit*.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

LUCRETI POEMATATA AND THE POET'S DEATH

THE date of Lucretius' death has been much discussed, but a very common opinion, advanced with more or less confidence, is that he died in October 55 B.C. The main object of this paper is to show the weakness of the case for that date: incidentally I shall make some suggestions with regard to several Lucretian problems.

There are two passages which purport to give the date of Lucretius' death. The first is one of Jerome's additions to the *Chronica* of Eusebius; it is inserted under Ol. 171. 3, which corresponds for him to 94 B.C.,¹ and runs as follows:

Titus Lucretius poeta nascitur; postea amatorio poculo in furorem uersus cum aliquot libros per interualla insaniae conscripsisset quos postea Cicero emendauit, propria se manu interfecit anno aetatis XLIII.

This would make Lucretius' death fall

¹ R. Helm, 'Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' *Chronik* (*Philologus*, Suppl. xxi. 2), 33.

in 51 or 50. The other passage is in the *Life of Virgil* attributed to Donatus:

initia aetatis Cremonae egit usque ad uirilem togam quam septimo decimo anno natali suo accepit, isdem illis consulibus iterum duobus quibus erat natus, euenitque ut eo ipso die Lucretius poeta decederet.

decimo om. G. :: natali suo *FABP* a natali suo '*Philargyrius*' natalis sui *MBmarg.* aetatis suae *GE* om. *S* vulgata :: duobus om. *GE*.

If the birthday in one's seventeenth year is that on which the year begins, then the date intended is 15 Oct. 54; if it is that on which one reaches the age of seventeen, the date is 15 Oct. 53; but if we accept the statement about the consuls, the birthday would be that of 15 Oct. 55, the day on which Virgil became fifteen years of age.

The testimony of Jerome can be discarded at once, not because some manuscripts place the notice not under the third year of the Olympiad but under the first and others again under the

fourth, for there is no doubt that accidental error or deliberate correction explains these divergences, but because the Saint inserted his notices with a light-hearted disregard for chronology. R. Helm, who has made a study of all the additions he made to Eusebius,¹ thinks that one of his chief concerns was to fill up any years that he found blank in his original. When Jerome can date a well-known historical event like the battle of Carrhae to 56, three years too early, no reliance can be put on his dating of Lucretius' birth, an occurrence no one would check. Moreover, the *bona fides* of the whole passage, often doubted, has recently been subjected to an annihilating attack by K. Ziegler,² who argues very plausibly that Jerome did not draw on Suetonius for this note.

The *Life of Virgil* attributed to Donatus is another matter; for it is generally agreed to be based on Suetonius.³ Unfortunately the text is both uncertain and contradictory. The passage is always edited and quoted with *natali suo* after *anno*; but there is another reading, *aetatis suae*, and a half-way house, *natalis sui*. Palaeographically the corruption is possible in either direction, nor are other considerations decisive. The weight of manuscript authority is apparently on the side of *aetatis suae*. The manuscripts are divided into two families: on one side are G, which is often the only manuscript to preserve the right reading, and *Σ* vulgata. G has *aetatis suae*: *Σ* vulgata rewrite the sentence with an addition, after their manner, but without *natali suo*; it is probable that, like G, the sub-archetype of this family had *aetatis suae*, which they omitted as otiose. The other group consists of MEFABP, and of these ME are said by Brummer⁴ to be nearest to the archetype: E has *aetatis suae* and M *natalis sui*. This evidence, though

favouring *aetatis suae*, is not conclusive, for FABP might have *natali suo* not by error but by interpolation from a good source,¹ and we are bound to consider the rival readings on their own intrinsic merits also. It may be said that *natali suo* is superior in point of sense, for *aetatis suae* adds nothing and might be due to *aetatis* just before. On the other hand, there is a certain improbability in *natali suo*, for it was the custom, though exceptions are known, to take the toga virilis at the Liberalia on March 17.² This is an inconclusive discussion, but it does appear, merely in view of this uncertainty, that it is unsafe to date Virgil's assumption of the toga, and consequently Lucretius' death, to the month of October.

Turning from the season of the year to the year itself, we have seen that the two clauses of Donatus are inconsistent. An entry in Jerome under Ol. 181. 4 (i.e. 53 B.C.)—*Vergilius sumpta toga Mediolanum transgreditur*—would support the first clause, but we cannot call on him to settle the matter, as we have seen the worthlessness of his testimony, and have to fall back on a calculation of probabilities. Most scholars agree to prefer the statement about the consuls to that about Virgil's age, maintaining that numerals are easily corrupted. Yet it is also possible that the consulship would be reckoned from the age, and a mistake could easily be made in counting the consuls.

There is a further weighty argument in favour of the age being correctly given. It seems likely that sixteen was a normal age in later Republican times for the assumption of the toga virilis. Marquardt argued with some plausibility that the traditional age had been seventeen, but that this was lowered during the first century to sixteen for boys who left home to train for a mili-

¹ See the preceding foot-note.

² *Hermes*, 1936, 421.

³ See most recently H. Naumann, 'Suetons Virgilvita', *Rh. Mus.* 1938, 334, who argues that, apart from one or two sentences, the *Life* is the authentic text of Suetonius' *Life of Virgil*.

⁴ *Vitae Vergilianae*, xi-xii.

¹ The *Life* which goes under the name of Philargyrius, an abridgement of Donatus, has a *natali suo*, but it was either abridged or interpolated from an inferior manuscript of the MEFABP group (cf. Naumann, 335, 374). One might suggest that a *natali* is derived from ^{na} ¹ *aetatis*.

² Ovid, *Fasti*, iii. 771.

tary or forensic career.¹ Unfortunately statistics on the age of taking the toga are unavailable: the only known instances from this period seem to be Cicero's nephew, who was in his seventeenth year (*ad Att.* i. 10. 5 and vi. 1. 12), his son, who was nearer sixteen than fifteen (*ad Att.* i. 2. 1 and ix. 19. 1), and Octavian, who had just turned fifteen. But Octavian was a particularly precocious youth, already in favour with his uncle, who immediately had him elected to the college of the pontifices. The narrative of Nicolaus of Damascus makes it clear that his assumption of the toga took place at an exceptionally early age. He uses the words ἀποθέσθαι μὲν αὐτὸν ἤδη τὴν περιπόρφυρον ἐσθῆτα, and goes on to say that though he was now legally a man he was allowed no more freedom than he had had before: νόμῳ τε μόνον ἀνὴρ ἦν, he concludes, τὰ δ' ἄλλα παιδικῶς ἐπεστατεῖτο.²

Young Cicero also took his toga under unusual circumstances, the date being March of 49 B.C. His father began to think about it at the beginning of March, perhaps with the approach of the Liberalia, and being unable to go to Rome, desired the ceremony to take place at Arpinum, where the boy could be introduced to his municipes. It is perhaps not fanciful to suppose that he reflected that if he postponed the giving of the toga till the next Liberalia he might not be alive, or if alive not even in Italy. Young Cicero was probably an advanced youth: he was at this time urging his father to take a more decided line, he served in Pompey's cavalry at the age of sixteen, and was aedile at Arpinum at that of nineteen.³

Under the Principate members of the

imperial household took the toga exceptionally early or exceptionally late according to the favour or disfavour in which they stood. The ages vary from thirteen for Nero to eighteen for Caligula, and provide no evidence for the normal age at which a private person would take the toga.¹

There is no reason for believing that Virgil was specially precocious. The accounts of his shyness and slowness of speech and the fact that his first book of poems was not published till he was thirty-three tell in the other direction. If he took the toga on his fifteenth birthday, he was younger than was the specially favoured Octavian,² and it would seem that if we have to choose between that statement and the one that he took it at what appears to be a normal time, that is during his seventeenth year, it is the latter statement that is the more credible.

It would suit my later argument to accept 53 on these grounds for the date of Virgil's toga, and to suppose that of Lucretius' death to be settled thereby. But that would in my opinion be to put too much trust in this *Life of Virgil*. Suetonius, if this is Suetonius, was not

¹ The statement to be met in some works of reference that the age was 14 to 16 seems to be derived from the imperial household. Blümner's remark that the ceremony was usually postponed for imperial persons must be due to oversight, being flatly contrary to the evidence. Of private individuals under the Principate we know that Persius was 16 (v. 30 ff., *Vita*, § 5), and Marquardt may be right in concluding that Crispinus (Statius, *Silvae*, v. 2), *angustus animus robustior annis*, was also 16. The future Emperor Galba, if any reliance is to be put on Dio Cassius' story (56, 29) that he took the toga on the first day of the month in which Augustus died, was 17, provided that ancient authorities are right in agreeing that he died aged 72. But Suetonius inconsistently says that he was born on 24 December 3 B.C., which would make his age 15, approaching 16. This year could have been obtained by reckoning 72 pairs of consuls inclusively from 69, the year of his death, whereas they should have been reckoned exclusively from the year in which he last had a birthday, which in this case happened not to be the same.

² If *aetatis suae* is accepted and the ceremony supposed to have taken place in the normal way at the Liberalia, then to accept the statement about the consuls means that we must believe that Virgil took the toga when only 14 years and 5 months.

¹ *Privatleben*, 130, followed by J. Regner in P.W. s.v. *tirocinium fori*, and H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer*, 335 ff.

² Frag. 127, §§ 8-10 (Jacoby). This evidence does not entirely lose its force because Nicolaus falsely reckons Octavian's age at this time to be still 14. Octavian assumed the toga in October. His predecessor in the pontificate, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, was killed in August. Was the reason why Octavian did not wait till the Liberalia for his toga that it was desired to take this opportunity of making him a pontifex?

³ *ad Att.* ix. 6. 1, 9. 2, 19. 1; *de Officiis*, ii. 45; *ad Fam.* xiii. 11. 3.

the most sceptical of biographers; and the Virgil-legend started to grow almost as soon as the poet was dead, or even in his lifetime, unless we are to accept the implications of Propertius, II. xxxiv. 71-6. It would take us too far afield to discuss the general credibility of the 'facts' given by the *Life*,¹ but we may observe that its early part is dominated by a desire to show that Virgil's infancy was attended by remarkable events: his mother dreamed that she gave birth to a laurel-cutting which on touching the ground immediately grew to a great tree covered with flower and fruit; the infant had such a benign expression that all prophesied a great future for him; and a poplar shoot put in the ground to mark his birth soon overtook poplars planted much earlier. The sentence which we have been considering is full of another kind of marvel, the marvel of coincidence; we have seen some reason to suppose that one of these coincidences is not original to Suetonius' text² and that another is probably untrue: it seems safer then to doubt the third also, remembering that though such coincidences do indubitably occur, they were also not uncommonly invented.

It seems then that all the evidence for the date of Lucretius' death slips through the fingers when examined, unless we can fall back on a sentence which Cicero wrote to his brother in February 54 (*ad Q.F.* II. ix. 3):

Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt, multis luminibus ingeni, multae tamen artis—sed cum ueneris.³

If this refers to *de rerum natura* the author must have been dead, for the poem is so unfinished that it can hardly have been published in his lifetime.

Perhaps it is the confusion engendered by romantic critics over *ars* and *ingenium* that has distracted attention

from the word *poemata*. Almost everyone has assumed that it must mean the six books *de rerum natura*, but has omitted to inquire whether the usage of the word favours that interpretation. I have not been able to find any other passage where *poemata* is applied to a single work in several books.⁴ It is possible, however, to distinguish several other applications of the word.

We must first notice that the singular *poema* does not always mean 'a poem'. The Greeks sometimes made a distinction between *ποίημα* and *ποίησις* in the sense that *ποίησις* was a complete long poetic composition, while *ποίημα* was a part of such a composition.⁵ Lucilius had explained this to the Romans:

pars est parua poema . . . epistula item quaeuis non magna poema est . . . illa poesis opus totum, tota Ilias una est thesis ut annales Enni.⁶

Similarly Varro wrote:

poema est λέξις ἑνὸς μὲν, id est uerba plura modice in quamdam coniecta formam: itaque etiam distichon epigrammation uocant poema.

Cicero knows this use of *poema*: at *de divinatione*, i. 66, he quotes nine lines of Ennius and exclaims *o poema tenerum et moratum et molle*. He also uses the plural to mean 'passages of poetry': at *Tusc. Disp.* ii. 26 we read the following dialogue:

fuisti saepe, credo, cum Athenis esses, in scholis philosophorum?

uero, ac libenter quidem.

animaduertebas igitur, etsi tum nemo erat admodum copiosus, uersus ab eis admisceri orationi?

ac multos quidem a Dionysio Stoico.

probe dicis. sed is quasi dictata, nullo dilectu,

¹ It is hardly relevant to quote Ovid, *Amores*, i. 15. 23 *carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti*, for the poets, not averse from poetic plurals, were particularly fond of this one: a single book, as the *Culex* (3), a poem, as the *Coma Berenices* (Catull. 65. 16), perhaps even a couplet (Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 568) may be called *carmina*. Aulus Gellius (i. xxi) tells us that Virgil found the word *amaror* in *carminibus Lucretii*. This is more noteworthy, as being in prose, but *carmina* is not *poemata*, and Gellius may have been affected by the common poetic use of the word.

² Examples in Marx, *Lucilius*, ii. 129; a similar distinction was made between *ποίησις* and *ποίημα*.

³ 338 Marx. *tota Ilias una* Dousa, *totaque illa summa* MSS. Further emendation is uncertain, but the sense seems clear. See also E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, iii. 126.

¹ The material to support the view that they were largely obtained by forced interpretation of the poems will be found in the edition by E. Diehl.

² *Σ* vulgata add yet another: Lucretius was Virgil's uncle.

³ For theories of the relation of this to what Quintus had said see p. xxxv of Diels's edition and add E. Bignone, *Alene e Roma*, 1936, 66. On *lumina* see E. E. Sikes, *Lucretius*, 38.

nulla eloquentia: Philo et proprium numerum et lecta poemata et loco adiungebat.¹

The Greek word ποιήματα can have yet another meaning, namely a single passage of poetry, consisting of a number of lines each of which might be called a ποίημα, or 'several words cast into a metrical form'. This is not uncommon in Dionysius of Halicarnassus; e.g. *Ant. Rom.* i. 41 τὰ δὲ ποιήματα ἔχει ᾧδε introduces three lines of Aeschylus.² There is an earlier example in Aristotle, *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 5 § 3, where ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς ποιήμασι refers to four lines by Solon.³ I have not found any certain examples of this usage in Latin, but there is a probable one in Petronius c. 41 and a possible one in Juvenal x. 124, and I notice that Tyrrell uses the expression 'his last effusion' (singular) in translating *recentia poemata* in Cicero, *ad Q.F.* ii. 8. 1.

Poemata also means 'poetry', usually in opposition to prose or to some non-literary activity. Thus in Catullus xxii the wit Sufferus

infacetost infacietior rure
simul poemata attigit.

Thus Horace warns the courtier to fall in with his patron's pursuits,

nec cum uenari uolet ille, poemata panges.
(*Epist.* i. 18. 40.)

This meaning shades off on the one hand into 'poems' and on the other into 'verses'. It is unnecessary to quote any examples of the meaning 'poems', though in passing it may be remarked that the word is sometimes used where we should say 'plays'.⁴

¹ The reading *et proprium numerum* is uncertain. The same alternation of *poemata* and *uersus* is found in Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* i. 8. 10: 'denique credamus summis oratoribus qui ueterum poemata uel ad fidem causarum uel ad ornamentum eloquentiae adsumunt . . . uidemus Enni etc. . . inseri uersus.' Cf. i. 2. 14. Perhaps the same meaning is to be seen in Cicero, *ad Att.* i. 16. 18: 'quae poemata quasque historias de Ἀμαθελῶ habes ad me mittas'. The *poemata* might be epigrams, but they might also be extracts from poems, just as the *historiae* will have been extracts from prose works on mythology.

² Cf. *Comp. Verb.* pp. 13, 14, 36, 129, and *Demosth.* p. 972.

³ Quoted by F. Blass, *Hermes*, 1895, 314.

⁴ Cic. *ad Fam.* xii. 18. 12, Vitruvius 103. 8, Apul. *Apol.* 5.

It seems, then, that the exact meaning of *Lucreti poemata* is uncertain. It might be translated 'the poetry of Lucretius', 'the passages of Lucretius',¹ or 'the passage of Lucretius'.² If we adopt the first rendering it is not necessary to suppose that the Ciceros had the complete work to criticize; if we adopt either of the other two, it seems reasonable to suppose the opposite. There is no reason why one or more passages of *de rerum natura* should not have been handed round in literary circles before Lucretius' death. One cannot maintain that it is impossible that the words *Lucreti poemata* refer to the poem as a whole; but one cannot say that they certainly or even probably do so. It is therefore unsafe to adduce them as proof of the date of Lucretius' death, which must be allowed to remain a matter of uncertainty.

It may be added that if the Ciceros were discussing, not the whole poem *de rerum natura*, but some passage or passages, there is less reason to be surprised, as many scholars have been, that on several occasions Marcus speaks derogatorily of all Latin writers on Epicureanism (*Tusc. Disp.* i. 6, *Acad.* i. 5, *Fin.* i. 8) and once boasts that he has never read any of them (*Tusc.* ii. 7).³

Finally I should like to make a suggestion. If Cicero was speaking of a passage or passages of Lucretius, it is natural to speculate on which he may have seen, and one realizes that there is one passage of the poem which above all others might have enjoyed a separate existence, namely the proem.⁴ This famous address to Venus is cast in the

¹ So F. Bockemüller, p. 5 of his edition of Lucretius.

² So M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*³, i. 2. 41. There is only an unintelligible vestigial remain of this view in the revised edition by C. Hosius.

³ Most recently Professor B. Farrington, *Modern Quarterly*, 1938, p. 216 and *Science and Politics in the Ancient World*, p. 191, finds much significance in the supposed self-contradiction.

⁴ So much was suggested by F. Bockemüller, loc. cit. It may be observed that Memmius, who is so honorifically mentioned, and the Ciceros were at this time all publicly bound to Caesar, and Marcus was on good enough terms with Memmius three years later (*ad Fam.* xiii. 1-3).

traditional form of the hymn—invocation, recital of power, prayer—and is completely self-contained. If Lucretius ever wrote lines to connect it with the sequel, those lines are lost.

Many readers have felt that this proem holds a reference to some particular occasion:

effice ut interea fera moenera militiæ
per maria ac terras omnis sopita quiescant

nam neque nos agere hoc patriæ tempore iniquo
possumus æquo animo nec Memmi clara propago
talibus in rebus communi desse salutem.

The most popular guess is Munro's, that the lines were written in 59, when Memmius was standing for the praetorship, and as a champion of the Senate against the Triumvirate had the approval of Cicero. But in 59 there was no particular threat of war: the affairs of the East had been settled by Pompey; Caesar had just celebrated a triumph for a campaign which had carried Roman domination to the west coast of Spain; and although there had been a momentary scare about Gaul in 60, all now seemed quiet again, since a treaty had been made with Ariovistus.

Contrast the state of affairs in the winter of 55/54 when Cicero's letter was written. Caesar had made inconclusive raids on Germany and Britain; Gaul was about to break into a long and determined revolt; Crassus was on his way to Parthia; and Pompey had been busy throughout the summer of 55 in raising troops with the pretence that the Spanish situation was threatening.

At home the Romans may have guessed that their anarchy was to come to a head; and amidst all this Memmius was now on the point of standing not for a praetorship but for the consulship itself.

Why has this occasion not been suggested for the date of the proem? It is because scholars have supposed that Lucretius died in October 55, and it seems probable that there was some sort of rift between him and Memmius before his death. The addresses to Memmius are confined to the earlier-written books I, II, IV; there are none in the later III, V, VI. But if we have no prejudice about the date of Lucretius' death, not only can we give the concluding lines of the proem an excellent reference, but we also have at hand something to explain Memmius' absence from the later books. For that sprig of the nobility entered into an illegal agreement with rival candidates in the election; he published the bargain himself, but was forced to go into exile in the summer of 54. His disappearance from Rome may have also meant his disappearance from the poem.¹

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ I have disregarded the *Vita Borgiana*, accepting the usual view that it is a Renaissance fraud. A. Rostagni, 'Ricerche di biografia lucreziana, II', *Riv. fil.* 1939, 113, argues that it contains genuine matter that goes back to Probus. It ascribes Lucretius' birth to 95 and gives him 44 years of life, and therefore does nothing to support the current opinions against which this article is directed.

PUNCTUM

ACCORDING to Lewis and Short and Georges-Georges¹ *punctum* in three passages means 'brief clause', 'short section', 'kleiner Abschnitt', 'einzelner Absatz', viz. Cicero, *De Or.* ii. 177, *Par.* pr. 2, Auson. *Id.* 12 pr.¹

¹ These three passages come from Forcellini, who puts them under the meaning 'breve et acutum dictum', expanded by Bailey into 'breve et acutum dictum. any brief or acute saying; the principal point or chief proposition in an argument &c.'

(1) In Cicero, *De Or.* l.c. *puncta* is a false reading for *interpuncta* or, just possibly, *interiuncta* (so Nonius).

(2) Cic. *Par.* l.c. reads: 'Cato autem, perfectus mea sententia Stoicus, et ea sentit quae non sane probantur in vulgus et in ea est haeresi quae nullum sequitur florem orationis neque dilatat argumentum, minutis interrogatiunculis, quasi *punctis*, quod proposuit efficit'. The interpretation of L. & S. and G.-G. here is supported by Stowasser ('Kleiner

Absatz, Abschnitt') and, with a slight grammatical difference, by Gaffiot ('par de petits raisonnements coupés comme en tranches').¹ The notion evidently is that *punctum*, reversing the process followed by κόμμα and κῶλον, from meaning '(punctuation) stop' came to be used of a group of words marked off by two stops.

The word *quasi* at once suggests doubts regarding the correctness of this interpretation. Stoic argument did run in short, choppy (*minutae*) syllogisms, e.g. 'nullum malum gloriosum est: mors autem gloriosa est: mors ergo non est malum' and the reply 'nihil indifferens gloriosum est: mors autem gloriosum est: mors ergo non est indifferens' (Sen. *Ep.* 82, 9 f.). Hence the apologetic *quasi* seems quite uncalled for. We could only account for it by saying that Cicero felt obliged to excuse himself for transferring to the spoken word what by rights belongs to the written word. But the fact that ancient manuscript-reading man had a livelier sense than modern print-reading man of the merely potential character of the written word hardly makes such an apology probable, and Cicero himself uses *interpuncta* of pauses in speech without making any excuse for so doing (*De Or.* ii. 177, iii. 181).

These doubts suggested by *quasi* are confirmed by *Fin.* iv. 7: 'Pungunt enim, quasi aculeis, interrogatiunculis angustis . . . ; res . . . non ita tractantur ut debent sed aliquanto minutius.' These words show that in *Par.* l.c. Cicero has in mind the thorny, spiky character of Stoic discourse often animadverted on by critics of the school. Cf. Cic. *Fin.* iii. 3 *spinosum*; ib. iv. 79 *spinas*; *De Or.* i. 83 *spinosa*; *T.D.* i. 16 *spinosiora*; *Ac.* ii. 112 *dumeta*; *De Or.* ii. 158 'ipsi se compungunt suis acuminibus'; Seneca, *Ep.* 82, 23 f. 'Verba mihi componis et interrogatiunculas nectis? . . . Et adversus mortem tu tam minuta iacularis? Subula leonem excipis? Acuta sunt ista quae dicis: nihil est acutius arista:

quaedam inutilia et inefficacia ipsa subtilitas reddit' (cf. ib. 22 'frangunt animum, qui nunquam minus contrahendus est et in minuta ac spinosa cogendus').

For *punctum* = 'prick', 'sting', cf. Plin. *N.H.* viii. 76. 2 (§ 201) 'Oculos suffusos capra iunci puncto [punctu Dalec.] sanguine exonerat, caper rubi'; xi. 24. 3 (§ 73) 'Ictus eorum [= crabronum] haud temere sine febris est. Auctores sunt ter novenis punctis interfici homines'; xxx. 47. 2 (§ 136) 'Oportet autem cineri misceri saniem punctis emissam'; Plin. *Pan.* 35. 3 'neque, ut antea, exsanguem illam et ferream frontem nequiquam convulnerandam praebeant punctis et notas suas rideant'. (In Phaedrus v. 3. 3 'punctum volucris parvulae voluisti morte ulcisci' *punctum* may be the accusative of *punctus*, as it certainly is in Plin. *N.H.* xi. 34. 3 (§ 100) 'quibusdam hebetes [sc. aculei insectis] neque ad punctum sed ad suctum'.)

(3) The relevant passage in Aus. *Id.* 12 pr. is this: 'Quae lecturus es monosyllaba sunt, quasi quaedam puncta sermonum; in quibus nullus facundiae locus est, sensuum nulla conceptio, propositio, redditio, conclusio, aliaque sophistica quae in uno versu esse non possunt: sed cohaerent ita ut circuli catenarum separati.' Ausonius is referring to a poem of sixteen hexameter lines, each of which begins and ends with a monosyllable, that at the end of the line being repeated at the beginning of the next (except of course the final one of all, which repeats the initial monosyllable of the poem). Ausonius is thus using *monosyllaba* by synecdoche for monosyllable-bounded lines—lines 'featuring' monosyllables—and all from *in quibus* to *separati* clearly refers to the lines. If *quasi quaedam puncta sermonum* also applies to *monosyllaba* as extended by synecdoche, then *puncta sermonum* must mean something like 'short sections'. But if so, why the apologetic *quasi quaedam*? There is at least a comma-pause at the end of each line, so that the lines *are*, actually and not merely in a manner, *puncta sermonum* in that sense. Is it not, then, better to suppose that in *quasi quaedam*

¹ Benoist and Goelzer also refer *punctis* to punctuation ('par de brèves interrogations faisant l'office de coupures').

puncta sermonum Ausonius drops the synecdoche and is thinking only of the actual monosyllables, which do 'more or less function as stops'? But even if this is not so, and he means by *puncta sermonum* 'short sections', that will hardly establish the same meaning for

punctis in *Par. l.c.* in face of the contrary evidence. W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

PS. I find that in his note on *aculeata* in *Cic. Ac. ii. 75* Reid cites *Par. l.c.*, *Fin. iv. 7*, *De Or. ii. 158*, and *Ac. ii. 98* as exemplifying the same metaphor.

ARISTOPHANES, *BIRDS*, 1122

ANYONE who reads the above line with correct pronunciation and accent (especially if we write it, as I am fairly confident that we should,

ποποῦ 'στι, ποῦ; ποποῦ 'στι, ποῦ; ποποῦ 'στι, ποῦ;)

must hear that the Messenger is cooing like a pigeon. This puzzled me for a long time, the more so as the commentators, ancient and modern, whom I have consulted, either say nothing about the line or merely babble. But the solution is to be found in that storehouse of curious information, Sir D'Arcy W. Thompson's *Glossary of Greek*

Birds (ed. 2, p. 242, where, however, the reference to Pausanias should be deleted, since he does not mention the subject at all in the passage quoted). The Messenger coos simply because he is a pigeon, a carrier, appropriately bringing the news. The evidence (Thompson, loc. cit.) is clear that occasional use of the homing habits of this bird was made quite early, though anything like regular use for military purposes or other is not testified to until later.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

REVIEWS

A LITERARY STUDY OF GREEK TRAGEDY

H. D. F. KITTO: *Greek Tragedy: a Literary Study*. Pp. x+410. London: Methuen, 1939. Cloth, 15s.

LITERARY criticism of classical authors is not generally of such high quality that we should mince words in greeting Mr. Kitto's book. His judgement is independent and acute; he never evades difficulties or accepts the easy but irrelevant solution; he writes with a persuasive lucidity and an unobtrusive wit.

The reader must not look here for biographies of the tragedians, for stylistic statistics or textual criticism. It is a 'literary study', which, taking the plays as plays, accounts for their form and feature in terms of the dramatic conceptions of their authors. A Greek tragedian did not set out to write 'a Greek tragedy'; and the failure to distinguish between types underlies much superficial criticism. K. makes a rough classification into Lyrical, Old, Middle, and New Tragedy. Of Lyrical Tragedy our only specimen is the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus, at once the climax of one tradition and transitional to its successor; in an admirable opening

chapter K. discusses the possibilities of single-actor drama. Old Tragedy is represented by the *Persae*, *Septem*, and *P.V.*—two-actor plays (for the third actor in *P.V.* is incidental). Why only two? Because Aeschylus was conservative? Rather because the austere characterization demanded by his tragic standpoint had no need of the third, which was introduced by Sophocles in order to illuminate his complex hero in different relations; and when, in the *Oresteia*, Aeschylus borrowed the third actor, it was to use him for un-Sophoclean purposes. It is to Sophoclean Middle Tragedy alone that the Aristotelian canons apply: the hero 'like us', the passage from 'happiness' to 'unhappiness', the concentration that leads to elegant form. In the comparable tragedies of Euripides (e.g. *Medea*, *Hecuba*, *H.F.*) we often find awkwardness of form, even crudeness of characterization. Is this incompetence? It is, rather, uncompromising loyalty to a tragic idea, abstract and analytical, in the interest of which the poet treats character and incident with detachment. It is not incompetence, for, when

Euripides wrote tragi-comedy (e.g. *Helen*, *Ion*) or melodrama (e.g. *El.*, *Or.*), his construction could be masterly, since he could now concentrate upon effectiveness for the stage. The same movement away from strictly tragic themes (New Tragedy) is seen in Sophocles: the *Philoctetes* is not a tragedy but an intellectual study, while the *Trachiniae* (which K. puts late) stands in an intermediate position, being a tragedy of Deianeira within a study of Heracles. By the needs of these different types, rather than by anything extraneous, we can explain characterization, plot-construction, use of chorus, prologues, and all the diverse phenomena of form.

This is a somewhat bald outline of K.'s leading generalizations; nor can a review do justice to his satisfying interpretations of particular plays. One generalization we miss. K. refers somewhere to 'what we normally mean by tragic', but he does not tell us what is the *genus* that embraces the varying tragic conceptions of the three tragedians. An un-English complaint: and doubtless we recognize a tragedy and feel a *catharsis* when we meet with them. But such a definition might have helped the discussion of Aeschylus, in particular. K.'s formulation of Aeschylean tragedy depends rather too much on Agamemnon, who is only dubiously the hero of his own play. Again, K. has an acute discussion of the relevance of Aeschylus' religion to his drama, in which he protests rightly against the view that 'an Aeschylean play is accounted for when some important doctrine, religious or philosophical, is seen in it'. But is the *Oresteia* accounted for when we have investigated the dramaturgy of its several plays? K. gives the *Choephoroi* and *Eumenides* their due as intellectual drama; but the 'intellectual' drama (if that is the word) begins with the beginning of the trilogy, with the first mention of Zeus and the Erinyes; there is a rhythm of the trilogy as a whole, in counterpoint with the constituent dramatic rhythms, and, if it is obscured, Aeschylus the dramatist suffers as well as Aeschylus the thinker.

But, upon the subject of Aeschylus, K. forestalls criticism by an engaging diffidence.

Nor is he prepared to fight over Euripidean frontiers. The distinction he draws between the tragedies and non-tragedies is valid in the main and cannot be explained by the commonplaces of Euripidean criticism (scepticism, realism, satire), towards which he is refreshingly cool. But sometimes he appears to underestimate the extent to which such things have formed, as well as coloured, the drama. Take the *Troades*. On K.'s interpretation, prologue and trial scene subserve the tragic theme. But is the prologue really so impressive? Does the trial-scene obey the 'law of increasing tension'? Surely the reverse, since its effect is to interest us in Helen's character of adventuress and her life in Troy—absorbing but non-tragic subjects. And is not the significance of Menelaus' verdict swamped by the certainty that he will capitulate at the first port of call? In the *Bacchae* K. misses the degree of the dramatist's detachment from Pentheus (ill described as a rationalist) in the interest of an intellectual theme. And is melodrama—a genre that eschews subtlety of characterization—more than a superficial description for plays of satirical dissection like the *Electra* and *Orestes*?

Naturally, any given student of Greek tragedy will demur to this or that point; far more often he will agree, or be converted; constantly he will admire. I mention for the pleasure of recollection K.'s treatment of the Redepaare in the *Septem*, of the role of Odysseus in the *Ajax*, of the dramatic rhythm of the *O.C.*, of the closing scene of the *Medea*. But his particular successes are less important than the admirable approach of the whole book, which is a worthy treatment of a great subject, clearing away misconceptions, revealing genius, and sending the reader back to the plays with a fresh appetite and a heightened appreciation.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Birkbeck College, London.

MURRAY ON AESCHYLUS

Gilbert MURRAY: *Aeschylus, the Creator of Tragedy*. Pp. xi+235. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

PROFESSOR MURRAY has done what was manifestly his duty. Of a poet as big as Aeschylus one sees, and says, what one can; little wonder, therefore, if another man's Aeschylus is different from one's own. Murray's is not the conventional one—the word 'romantic' is used surprisingly often in connexion with the poet—but this study is full of stimulus and instruction.

With Murray's first proposition, that Aeschylus was in a real sense the creator of tragedy, no one is likely to quarrel; though he tries to prove too much, I think, and with insufficient evidence. After all, we know next to nothing about Choerilus, Pratinas, and the rest, and we can hardly prove that Aeschylus was the first dramatist to use myth seriously. The next point is the boldness of Aeschylus' stage technique and poetic style. Here the contrast between his opulence and the restraint that succeeded it is well emphasized, but when Murray says that Aeschylus later 'deliberately reduced' the demands that he made on scene and language, he forgets that the *Eumenides* is certainly and the *P.V.* probably among the latest plays.

The greater part of the book is concerned with Aeschylus 'the poet of ideas'. This discussion brings out many illuminating points. It ranges widely, but without getting out of control, though not always is it brought into sufficiently close connexion with the plays themselves. Thus, in the excellent chapter on the *Oresteia*, Aeschylus' conception of Zeus is said to be 'a divine Power which thinks, understands, and learns by suffering', a God who, unlike the primitive Law of Retribution, can make allowances and forgive. Though it is not clear how, or where, Zeus 'learns by suffering', the idea illuminates the *Oresteia*, but applied to the *P.V.* it does strange things. In this trilogy, we are told, Aeschylus was oppressed by the fact of the non-moral

government of the universe, but he saw an escape in the 'perfectibility of God': Zeus learns by suffering. 'This brutal, non-moral; external world which still dominates man and shocks his conscience has itself a possibility of evolving towards something more spiritual and more concordant with our higher ideals.' But this is to interpret a play by applying a formula, and the formula does not fit. If it was part of Aeschylus' idea that 'he [Zeus] has also led man along the road of thought', why does Aeschylus spend so much time in telling us that it was Prometheus who did this? And the establishment of the historical Prometheus-ritual at the end of the trilogy must mean that the 'perfecting' of Zeus is not a remote hope but an accomplished fact. And the contradiction between this still brutal Zeus and the Zeus of the *Oresteia* is hardly met by the assertion that the very emotion with which Aeschylus professes his faith in *Ag.* 750 ff. is a sign that he found difficulty in believing it. A disturbing thought, that the more a poet protests the less we are to believe him.

The book is defined as one of 'literary criticism, not of technical scholarship, much less of archaeology'. There is indeed no archaeology, but there is anthropology, which is worse; for at least archaeology cannot be confused with literary criticism. Murray maintains his view that Tragedy originated in the rituals of the Year-daemon. As literary critics we may be content with that, since our affair is not what Tragedy came from but what it *is*. But when Murray insists that the Year-daemon not only originated Tragedy but also explains its spirit, one must protest. His book will, inevitably and rightly, be read by many who have no Greek; these will get some odd ideas of Greek tragedy. They should be warned that it was an adult art, having no more direct contact with primitive ideas than any other civilized art. They should be warned that Murray short-circuits things, for though the vegetation-ritual gave rise to certain myths, the

dramatist used these myths for his own purpose with no reference to their origin. To Euripides, the *σπαργμός* of Hippolytus is only a dramatic detail in the myth; its origin is nothing. Even more striking is the *σπαργμός* of Pentheus; the subject is Dionysiac, but Euripides is so indifferent to, or ignorant of, the origin of the incident that he has the wrong man torn to bits. And if the Eniautos-daemon is to be allowed to raise his head in the *Persae*, in explanation of its theme of the punishment of *ἄβρις*, can he fairly be kept out of Demosthenes *In Midiam*? But it may be put to the credit of this ubiquitous spirit that he keeps out of the *Eumenides* discussion of the patriarchal and matriarchal forms of society.

As for the 'resurrection of the hero', is it not true that 'the conception of a

Triumph over Death', which Murray thinks fundamental to Tragedy, belongs to Christian, not to Greek art? *Samson Agonistes* makes us feel that 'whether the hero is dead or no, he has in some deeper sense actually conquered the evil to which his body succumbed, and that "nothing is here for tears"'; but the greatness of Greek tragedy surely lies in the intellectual strength with which it faces the problems of life; its spiritual effect (one can hardly say 'consolation', for it is stronger than that) in the fact that we have faced these problems with our eyes open. If all this originated in resurrections and rebirths, then Greek tragedy has so completely outgrown its origins that these belong not to criticism but to anthropology.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

CAMPBELL'S AGAMEMNON IN ENGLISH

A. Y. CAMPBELL: *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, translated into English verse, with an introduction and explanatory notes, and an appendix of new notes on the text. Pp. xxii+95. University Press of Liverpool, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1940. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THE text which Professor Campbell translates is his own, published in 1936, with some alterations which are indicated in the notes appended to this volume. In some few lines he has reverted to readings already familiar, and some of the notes only contain corrections of punctuation, &c.; but in the main his text is unaltered. It was reviewed in vol. li, pp. 59 ff. of this journal; in it a large number of passages, many of which earlier scholars have found far from hopeless, are virtually rewritten, and many lesser changes are made of which the justification is not apparent; but this is not the place to discuss these. It is only necessary to warn Greekless readers of the translation that it does not attempt to represent what most scholars would accept, without strong qualifications, as the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus.

The Introduction contains two brief

sections entitled 'Some Facts about Aeschylus' and 'Two Cautions about the *Agamemnon*'. The former incidentally describes the Eleusinian mysteries as 'a cult associated with the widespread and influential religion known in different varieties as Orphic and Pythagorean'. The truth seems to be rather that (as Mr. Guthrie and others have shown) 'the religion of Eleusis remained fundamentally different from that of Orpheus' (Guthrie, *Orpheus*, p. 154). It is perhaps more likely that Aeschylus visited Sicily twice and not (as Professor Campbell says) three times; but the point is unimportant.

In a third section of the Introduction we are told about the aims and methods of this translation. 'I have tried', Professor Campbell says, 'to produce something which should sound as much like the original as I could make it. The language of Aeschylus is sonorous, rich, bold, dignified, various and pointed; at the same time it is normally . . . lucid and rhythmical. . . . To reproduce such language, so far as might be within my capacity, has been throughout my first endeavour, and to come as close as this preoccupation permitted to the reproduction of the sense has been my

second.' Further, the translation is intended for spectators, 'not merely without access to books, but without time to ponder. This in fact is but one more feature of the original which I have done my best to recreate, its immediate and direct intelligibility to an audience'; and the audience in view is 'a quick and intelligent, but almost wholly Greekless audience'. The result of this desire for intelligibility is the insertion of a good deal in the translation that would find its natural place in an elucidatory commentary, and many passages, especially in the choruses, are, for this or other reasons, half as long again in the translation as in the original, and sometimes seem to be very remote from any text. (Space does not allow of quotation, but the *κομμός* will serve as an illustration, or a large part of the opening anapaests of the parodos.) The effect of this is something quite unlike Aeschylus, who does *not* pause to explain himself at every point, and has none of this redundancy and prolixity, and, almost certainly, was often *not* fully intelligible at first hearing even to an enlightened Athenian. All this explanatory matter, and the countless words and phrases inserted to make up a line, detract immeasurably from the forcefulness of Aeschylus and in some passages there is so much non-Aeschylean matter that, in the translation even of passages which I have known by heart for fifty years, I have been at a loss to 'find my place'.

And after all, is the result such as to be intelligible even to a 'quick and intelligent' spectator, 'without time to ponder'? What of passages like these? (the lines of the Greek text are given in brackets): 101, 2 (76-7) 'And as the marrowy sap that deep | still broods within the lengthening bone . . .'; 126-8 (97-8) 'Therefore, what bode thy narded reeks (Gk. *τούτων*) | As knowledge or State needs afford | So far now graciously reveal'; 407-9 (324-5) 'So captured there and captors clamorously | In the same street through truceless languages | Raise jarful utterance of their diverse lot'; 369 (301) 'Launched on his major flight the cornered beam'; 471 (*circ.* 378,

but not in the Greek) 'Plethora's a traitress'; 1116-17 (959-60) 'Fostering her own proliferate purple stain | Of dyes industrial an exhaustless jet'; 1366 (1126-7) 'She trammels Blackhorn in voluminous ruse'. There are many places where Professor Campbell turns a quite simple Greek line into something needlessly obscure or elaborate: e.g. 361 (280, *καὶ τίς τὸδ' ἐξίκοιτ' ἄν ἀγγέλων τάχος*; 'Now who could compass thus express a post?'; 635-7 (522, *ἦκει γὰρ ὑμῖν φῶς ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φέρων*) 'He comes . . . scattering like sunshine a portentous shade'; 656 (543, *πῶς δὴ; διδαχθεὶς τοῦδε δεσπόσω λόγου*) 'How? let illumination speed that speech'; 721 (598, *καὶ νῦν τὰ μάσσω μὲν τί δεῖ σ' ἐμοὶ λέγειν*); 'And now what skills thy fuller circumstance?'. Dictionary-makers will thank Professor Campbell for some new words and idioms: *bate* and *gloat* as nouns ('Hail also, in *bate* of thy fell archery', 'The *gloat* that hailed her victory', 'Her godless *gloat* swells harshly'); 'Helena! the *Captress*. Fatal name!'; 'Canvas ever *at furl*' (? analogous to 'at full stretch'; but why not 'furled?'): the verbs 'to *voluptuarize*', and 'to *inarticulate*', and others. If it were not for the rest, I should suspect that in l. 240 (188) 'His army *fusts* on Aulis' shores' might be a misprint; as it is, I am not sure; the word is not bad company for 'narded reeks' and 'jarful'.

Many lines and phrases, I fear, seem to me to be just prose. Agamemnon appears often to bring prose into the translator's mind: he is twice called 'the senior prince', and l. 643 (530)—which I cannot scan—reads 'His Majesty Atrides the Elder, Fortune's friend'. Sometimes a prosaic or ugly phrase is dragged in, which corresponds to nothing at all in the Greek (the italics are mine): 61-2 (*circ.* 45) 'One thousand ships, an Argive band | *To burn his walls about his ears*'; 1005-6 (*circ.* 825, but the Greek has already been more than fully translated) 'Then, big with treachery, | *That equine mother cubbed her carnivore*'; 1133-7 (972-972a—the latter invented and inserted by Professor Campbell himself) 'Whilst therein ranges wide | The authoritative male.

O, never fear! | *This marine product* stretches for thy feet'; 1679 (1382), 'A boundless trammel o'er his brawn I fling'. The italicized words are all gratuitous additions to the original. Here are other characteristic lines: 595 (485) 'Credulous unduly is the female sex'; 683 (565) 'Or the heat, when Ocean his siesta took'; 1357 (1121) 'Quick to the aorta crowd the jaundiced gouts'; 1378 (1133) 'Calamity is their stock-in-trade', and (perhaps best of all) 788-9 (657, ἄχοντ' ἄφαντοι ποιμένος κακοῦ στρόβω) 'They are gone, they are

swallowed, and the pervert shepherd | Has wolfed the flock'. Is this Aeschylus—or Aristophanes?

In a note on p. 84 Professor Campbell writes modestly, 'I am no great connoisseur of poetry as such'. Let us leave it at that. But if so, why translate Aeschylus? Much of the language of Aeschylus is not really foreign to English idiom; there is much in *Macbeth* and *King Henry V* that is truly Aeschylean; but he needs a born poet for his translator.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

THE NEW OXFORD EDITION OF THE *ION*

Euripides, *Ion*, edited with introduction and commentary by A. S. OWEN.

Pp. xlv+196. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

AT Verrall's feet it was impossible not to think the *Ion* a masterpiece, and those whom he bewitched can still recapture a shadow of the charm from his inimitable epilogue. In the cold light, no doubt, that spell for most of us lies broken, though Mr. Owen's heavy refutation (how Verrall would have winced at "Euripides the human" has a heart, as Virgil has'!) almost goads one to revive it. At least we must cry, with the noble Argive, *pol me occidistis, amici*, for what remains is surely a sorry affair. To approach Greek tragedy by this path is like approaching Greek sculpture by the Vatican galleries.

Mr. Owen's Introduction does the best for the play, but his attitude is so indeterminate that a blurred impression is left on the mind. Parts of his exposition are incoherent. He defends on p. xxi the action of the priests as 'shifty, but humane, in so far as they had prevented murder being committed in the sacred precincts', and he goes on: 'Where they had failed in humanity was in the treatment of Creusa. . . . Here is a boy, the child of a woman passionately eager to find again the babe that she had exposed, and the oracle makes that boy appear to be the son of some other woman, and she is to go away childless.' If we are to believe in a real god giving real oracles, it is

idle to blame the priests: if on the other hand, as Mr. Owen implies, the god was a figment ('to Euripides the Delphic oracle was a piece of trickery'), blame is again idle, for only omniscience could have told the priests that Ion was Creusa's child—indeed, if miracles are barred, he obviously was *not*. It is also wrong to quote the οὐ πέδον τίκτει τέκνα of Xuthus (542) as proof of 'his unimaginative mind': in the world of Euripides no sane man, so taken off his guard, could have spoken otherwise. On p. xix we are told that in the prologue 'something is definitely announced . . . as going to happen, which does not'. The reference is evidently to 69 ff., but everything there stated as future *fact* (δώσει . . . φήσει) does happen, only Apollo's wishes (ὥς . . . γνωσθῇ . . . καὶ γάμοι . . . γένωνται) are unfulfilled.

Much of the Introduction deals in an interesting way, but at disproportionate length, with the legendary credentials of *Ion*. Some of the arguments are dubious, for instance one on p. xiii, which Mr. Owen uses to establish the *Ion*'s priority over the *Creusa* of Sophocles: 'The name of Creusa is still unfamiliar at the time of the production of Euripides' play, for he emphasizes it by repeating it six times in Hermes' opening speech.' In the prologue of the *Electra* the *autourgos* names the not unfamiliar Aegisthus six times and Electra in the next speech twice—eight namings of Aegisthus in the first 62 lines of the *Electra* against six of Creusa in

the first 72 lines of the *Ion*. Here and elsewhere Mr. Owen is too apt to follow Wilamowitz.

On p. xlii the account of the numbering of the plays in L is wrong, being apparently rearranged in an unsuccessful effort to produce exact alphabetical order. Mr. Owen transposes *Supplices* and *Ion* and shifts *Cyclops* to the end from its true place after *Heraclidae*, which makes nonsense of the last sentence of his paragraph.

It is perhaps misleading to dwell on defects of this kind, since the book's strength lies chiefly in the Commentary, where Mr. Owen's familiarity with usage and idiom stands him in good stead. Here too, however, there are many things to criticize. Both his accounts of the omphalos (pp. 68 and 87) are unsatisfactory, and the statement that Pindar's *κηληδόνες* in *Paean* xi. 9—which were 'over the pediment'—are the figures on the omphalos is absurd. The implication on p. 83 that metopes were confined to the pronaos is also

wrong. The presence of swans would not (p. 81) defile the Delian lake, of which they were the pride. In the note on l. 94 the 'noble Delphians' certainly resemble the Pope's 'Noble guard', but not, as Mr. Owen says, his 'Swiss guard'.

In the note on ll. 579–80 the alternative which Mr. Owen prefers—'you shall not be called both baseborn and poor—for you will not be called the latter'—seems to be refuted by the next line *ἀλλ' εὐγενὴς τε καὶ πολυκτήμων βίον*. But in general his judgement is good and his choice of readings judicious and supported by sound reasoning. Like all the editors of this series he suffers from the rule, against which it is the duty of all reviewers to continue to protest, that he must use a text and apparatus of which he repeatedly disapproves. Had he been free, he would doubtless have printed some of the excellent new suggestions by Mr. D. L. Page which he records in his notes.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

SOLON AND THE EPITAPHIOS

LEO WEBER: *Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede*. Pp. ii+118. Frankfurt a. M.: Schulte-Bulmke, 1935. Paper, RM. 10.

THE institution and historical development of the *λόγος ἐπιτάφιος* at Athens is a subject which has engaged the passing curiosity of many before now, but held the attention of few, perhaps because it does not fall wholly within the province of either the historian or the literary critic. I doubt, in fact, whether any full-length discussion of the evidence has been published since Hauvette contributed an article, 'Les Éleusiens d'Eschyle et l'institution du discours funèbre à Athènes', to the *Mélanges Henri Weil*, in which he maintained that the custom of delivering an oration in the Ceramicus at the public funeral of those who had fallen in battle for their country had its origin in the period of the Persian Wars. And Hauvette wrote over forty years ago. Dr. Weber thus has good ground for examining the position afresh; and even if, in the

present state of our knowledge of early Attica, some of his conclusions must remain conjectural, he has rendered a considerable service in assembling so conveniently evidence, literary and archaeological, which has hitherto been widely dispersed and therefore difficult to assess at its true value.

The present essay sets out to show, first, that while the *λόγος ἐπιτάφιος* of the classical period seems to have been a purely Athenian institution, its origins are not necessarily to be sought in Attica; secondly, that the use of the Ceramicus as a place of burial from at least the beginning of the Geometric period and the survival there of certain cults, notably that of the half-god, half-hero Androgeos, which retained features characteristic of the funeral ceremony of the heroic age, must have determined both the form and the place of state interments of the fifth century; and thirdly, that the appearance of a prose oration as part of the ceremonial must have been due to Solon. In arguing the

first and second parts of his case Dr. Weber is convincing. Admittedly, the literary evidence which can be quoted to prove the existence of what he styles *αἶνοι ἐπιτύμβιοι*, as distinct from *θρήνοι*, in the epic period is meagre in the extreme. But it is not hard to show that the *θρήνος* itself is primitive; and, as to lament a dead man one must also praise his greatness during life, we have in the early *θρήνος* the remote ancestor from which the Attic *λόγος ἐπιτάφιος* in due time sprang. Dr. Weber is also plausible when he insists that the survival in the Ceramicus of cults which throughout retained marked traces of the ceremonial seen at the funeral of the Homeric chieftain (e.g. the *ἄγών* attached to the Androgeos cult reflects the funeral games celebrated for Patroclus) influenced Athenian practice in historical times. State burials, in other words, and the ritual with which they were celebrated were more probably a legacy from the remote past than an institution of the classical period. It is less easy to accept Dr. Weber's arguments, however, when he turns to the *λόγος ἐπιτάφιος* itself and suggests that it was Solon who introduced it as a substitute for the earlier *θρήνος* or *αἶνος*, which had been sung. Admittedly, the evidence of Diodorus (xi. 33) and Dionysius (v. 17), used by Hauvette and others before him to prove that the funeral

speech was an innovation of the fifth century, is not satisfactory and can be shown to contradict itself. But is the evidence for Solon much better? It consists in effect of what Plutarch fails to say in his *Life of Solon*, ch. 21. From that chapter it is clear that Solon concerned himself with the regulation of private mourning. But there is not a word of public burials. Dr. Weber's answer that the introduction of the *λόγος ἐπιτάφιος* was either so familiar a fact that it needed no mention or so unimportant that it had been forgotten by Plutarch's time is hardly satisfactory. Nor can he be said to have strengthened his case greatly by his ingenious attempts to show (e.g. from Herodotus) that the prose *λόγος*, Ionian by origin, was familiar enough as a means of expression in Solonian Athens to have been grafted on to public ceremonial of a traditional kind. It is possible, certainly; but equally possible, as far as that goes, is the older hypothesis, according to which the prose *laudatio* came into being a century later, distorted echoes of the innovation being preserved in Diodorus and Dionysius. We are, in fact, here faced with something which is still *ἤερί καὶ νεφέλη κεκαλυμμένον*, and, until fresh evidence is forthcoming, it will remain so.

K. J. MAIDMENT.

Merton College, Oxford.

THE BUDÉ ISOCRATES

Isocrate, *Discours*, Tome II. Texte établi et traduit par G. MATHIEU et E. BRÉMOND. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. 205. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 40 fr.

It is some ten years since the first volume of the Budé Isocrates appeared; but the partnership which had such happy results in 1928 is still unbroken. Like its predecessor, Tome II is the joint work of Professor Georges Mathieu and M. Émile Brémond; and its quality promises that, when they have at length finished the heavy task which they have set themselves, they will have made a valuable contribution to the study of

their author. As in their first volume, they have arranged the contents chronologically, instead of reproducing them in the arbitrary order canonized by Wolf's edition of 1571; and the change will be most welcome to anyone who wishes to see Isocrates in a true perspective. His early work as a logographer leads up to his activity as a publicist, instead of following it, as any nineteenth-century edition would suggest; nor are his political manifestos properly intelligible unless read as a sequence in their historical context.

The present volume, which covers the period of Isocrates' maturity, c. 380-350 B.C., contains the six pieces *Pane-*

gyricus, Plataicus, Ad Nicoclem, Nicocles, Evagoras, and Archidamus. Each is furnished with a detailed introduction, the two first written by Professor Mathieu, the remainder by M. Brémond. Here will be found an able discussion of literary and historical problems with plentiful references to the work of earlier and contemporary scholars in the same field, and an account of the MS. authorities available for the reconstruction of the text. The translation itself, for which both collaborators seem to be jointly responsible, makes delightful reading and will doubtless confirm others besides myself in the opinion that, if the perfect rendering of any of the Greek orators is ever produced, it will come from a Frenchman. French is the one language which can be rhetorical without being woolly; and it can reproduce things as fragile as the periods of Demosthenes or Isocrates without loss of either clarity or cadence. In the present instance the translators have been accurate as well as graceful; and the few changes that have suggested themselves to me involve such nuances of interpretation that to specify them would be captious.

The text contains little or nothing in the way of novelty; and I do not imagine that MM. Mathieu and Brémond would pretend that it represented any substantial advance on the work of Drerup, upon whom they have drawn largely. As they stated in the preface to their first volume, they have allowed Urbinas III (*I*) full weight as the representative of a tradition independent of, and generally much superior to, that of Vaticanus 65 (*A*) and its congeners, upon which the text of Isocrates rested (uneasily enough) until the time of Bekker; and they have made it, to-

gether with its descendants *A* and *E*, the foundation of the present edition. The principle is admirable; but, like many other manuscripts, *I* has suffered extensively from correction—six different hands can be detected at work. What is the relation (*a*) between the correctors and *A* and *E*, (*b*) between the correctors and the vulgate? The editors seem to have no clear idea; or, if they have, they do not let the reader know what it is. For instance, at *Evag.* 79 ἀμειλιμένοις of the first hand of *I* is preferred to ἀγωνιζομένοις of *I* corr., *A*, and the vulgate (and so too at *Plat.* 18, where παύσονται of *I* is accepted as against παύσονται κακῶς ποιούντες of the remaining manuscripts and, presumably, *I*'s corrector). Yet at *Evag.* 66 Ὅς αὐτὸν μὲν is read with *A*, the chief representative of the vulgate, when ὅς is omitted in *I* and, as Sauppe saw, the text is better without it. There is also some looseness in the use of critical signs and abbreviations in the apparatus, which detracts from its value, in spite of its apparent fullness. Thus at *Plat.* 19. 1 we read 'κατηγόρουν ΓΕ: κατηγοροῦσιν cett.'; and in the next note 'καθίστασαν ΓΕ: καθιστᾶσιν vulg.' *A*'s reading in the first is presumably included in the 'cett.'; but in the second can hardly be included in the 'vulg.'. Yet if it sides with the vulgate as against ΓΕ, as often happens elsewhere, it is worth recording.

The printing in general is accurate. There are one or two dropped letters in the text, and Ἑλληνίδων at the foot of p. 158 lacks a breathing, while ἀφελῶς Valckenaer: ἀσφαλῶς cett.' at *Pan.* 11. 3 looks as though it is a mistake for ἀσφαλῶς codd.'.

K. J. MAIDMENT.

Merton College, Oxford.

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF PLATO

P. LEON: *Plato*. Pp. 147. London: Nelson, 1939. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

MR. LEON contributes to the series 'Discussion Books' a very readable and interesting short account of Plato, covering his life, teaching, and present-day message. The sketch of the life

gives much space to the Sicilian enterprise; and about half the book is devoted to the political aspects of Plato's work. Brief chapters deal with his predecessors in philosophy and with his metaphysical and ethical doctrine. In expounding the theory of Ideas the

author suggests 'spirit' as a translation for *εἶδος*, in order to convey the element of 'life and power' implied at *Sophist* 248 e. The experiment is interesting, but seems hardly justified in relation to the earlier form of the theory.

The account of Plato's social and political teaching centres naturally on the *Republic*, which is summarized clearly and with much skill. Mr. Leon brings out both the historical setting and the modern significance of Plato's system, and some of his terms are very suggestive; thus the timocratic temper becomes 'militarist', and tyranny 'dictatorship'—though 'the dictatorial man' is not quite so happy a translation.

It is in the last chapter, entitled 'Plato and Christ', that the point and purpose of the book become clear. Plato's Sicilian disappointment has already been strongly underlined; now we are told of the general inadequacy of his thought and system, as typifying 'the failure of idealism' both then and to-day. 'He could not solve the problem of the many'; that is, he does not provide for the perfection of the com-

mon man, or cope with the difficulty of evil. Here is some acute criticism, but also some questionable interpretation leading up to the statement (p. 129) that 'evil, we must conclude, is somehow or other present in the world of Ideas itself'. This brings us to a section headed 'Plato's Lack of Inspiration', which reconstructs his state of mind and soul with possibly presumptuous thoroughness and pronounces that 'he had no real experience of the divine'. The author's conclusion is that Plato's need was the same as the present need of idealism and of our civilization—not the Christianity which is a species of Platonism, but Christ'. Mr. Leon makes his final point with manifest sincerity; his little book may fulfil its object and lead to fruitful discussion. But by concentrating overmuch on the political side of Plato's work, and still more by using him as an 'embodiment' (p. 36) of the shortcomings of antiquity even at its best, he has imperilled the value of his book as a balanced and objective study.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

ARISTOTELIAN PAPERS

Lane COOPER: *Aristotelian Papers*, revised and reprinted. Pp. xi+237. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, \$2.50 or 14s. 6d.

THE first half of this volume consists of a reprint, with some revision, of eight articles previously published and still easily accessible; the second of reviews of ten books, dating from 1916 to 1936. In all of these chapters some connexion is made with Aristotelian writings, though it is sometimes rather slight. The articles on 'Some Wordsworthian Similes' and 'The Climax' compile a number of illustrations, mostly modern and very familiar, but pleasant enough, of Aristotle's remarks about *εὐφρία* as the source of metaphor and about *ἐπ' οὐκ οὐκ*. Another article, entitled 'Galileo and Scientific History', incidentally corrects an earlier statement by the author about Aristotle's theory

of the rate of motion of falling bodies. The chapter on 'The Rhetoric of Aristotle and its Relation to the Poetics' asserts (what no one is likely to deny) the usefulness of a knowledge of the *Rhetoric* for the interpretation of the *Poetics*, and compares Butcher as an Aristotelian scholar to his disadvantage with Bywater (as do other passages in the book).

The other four articles deal with some difficult passages in the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, to discuss which would need more space than can be given in a short review. The essay on 'The Fifth Form of Discovery' (*Poet.* xvi. 1455^a12-16) was noticed in this journal in 1924 (xxxviii, p. 209), when it formed part of the author's volume *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*; the reviewer sees no reason to change the opinion which he then held, that the discussion was inevitably unsatisfactory, because both

the longer and the shorter readings of the passage (in *Parisinus* 1741 and *Riccardianus* 46) are impossible as they stand, and the emendation and correlation of them have never been satisfactorily accomplished. Professor Cooper still makes no reference to the longer reading, which ought not to be simply passed over. The passage discussed in the next article, *Rhet.* III. xi. 1412^a32-^b3, containing a pun on the words *θράττει σε* (or something like them), must also be considered to be still unexplained, though Professor Cooper's various suggestions show an entertaining ingenuity. Another article also deals with an unsolved difficulty, that of *Rhet.* III. xvi. 1417^b16-20, where Aristotle is speaking of the use of narrative in deliberative oratory. *ἀν δ' ἢ ἄπιστον, ὑπισχνέσθαι τε καὶ αἰτίαν λέγειν εὐθύς, καὶ διατάττειν οἷς βούλονται, οἷον ἢ Ἰοκάστη ἢ Καρκίνου ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι ἀεὶ ὑπισχνέται πυνθανομένου τοῦ ζητούντος τὸν νῖόν, καὶ ὁ Αἰμῶν ὁ Σοφοκλέους.* Here all commentators and translators, including Professor Cooper, give to *ὑπισχνέσθαι* a meaning to which I can find no parallel elsewhere, 'to guarantee the truth of a statement': and this partly vitiates his explanation of the way in which Haemon's speech in Sophocles illustrates the precept. The meanings assigned to *διατάττειν* by various scholars also appear to have no parallel. There can be little doubt that the passage is incurably corrupt: but Professor Cooper's exposition of the clause about Jocasta may well be correct, at least if we may take *ὑπισχνέσθαι* in its ordinary sense of 'promise'; Jocasta, interrogated by Oedipus as to what has become of her son by Laius, keeps on promising to explain.

The article on *κόσμος* in *Poet.* xxi. 1457^b2 is not particularly helpful. Professor Cooper thinks that the definition

of *κόσμος* was omitted because every one would know what it meant and what 'beautiful words' were, and that 'any word that is ornamental, whether adjective, noun or adverb, is an ornamental word'. 'Wherever we find beauty, there we shall look for ornamental words.' He is surely wrong in thinking that *κόσμος* in the *Poetics* need not be a single word; it comes, in every passage, in a classification of single words. Bywater's note on the word, which Professor Cooper thinks inadequate, appears to say quite perfectly all that a good scholar can safely say on the subject.

It may be doubted whether it was worth while to publish long afterwards reviews of books, the value of most of which has already been proved or disproved by use, and some of those which Professor Cooper republishes are very slight. The best of them—and it contains some good criticism—is that on 'Coleridge, Wordsworth and Lowes'; but so far as Classical studies are concerned what is of permanent interest in them would have been more conveniently collected as a series of comments on passages in the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*, in the order of their places in the text. On pp. 161, 2 the Oxford translation of *Rhet.* III. x. 1411^a18-20 is rightly corrected; the other comments mostly repeat what their author had written elsewhere. Incidentally, it is sad to learn how many great Aristotelian scholars have gone astray or have given themselves unnecessary trouble because they omitted to consult Professor Cooper's writings, and it is natural that he should regret (p. 163) that Bywater did not live long enough to benefit by such illumination.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

CICERO'S *BRUTUS* AND *ORATOR* IN THE LOEB LIBRARY

Cicero, *Brutus*, with an English Translation by G. L. HENDRICKSON; *Orator*, with an English Translation by H. M. HUBBELL. Pp. v + 538. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1939. Cloth, 10s. 6d.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THIS volume, taken as a whole, is a sound and scholarly piece of work.

Mr. Hubbell's translation of the *Orator* is extremely accurate, and the style is deft, incisive, and finished. With this to supplement Sandys's commentary,

to which due acknowledgement is made for occasional borrowings, our students are indeed well provided, and will be specially grateful for many of the clarifying footnotes. There are slight misprints in §§ 94 and 156; *animadversio* (195) is probably 'blame' rather than 'attention'; 'assuring that' (60) for 'ensuring that', and 'a different kind than' (93) will displease precisians.

The *Brutus* is more interesting than the *Orator* and far less difficult, but it contains many phrases that require watching. Mr. Hendrickson has been for decades an indefatigable worker in the field of Roman literary history, and his learned articles on various complex problems have won wide acceptance. His style of translation has the same characteristics as Mr. Hubbell's, but he is frequently careless in expression, and though fully acquainted with the background and the technical vocabulary, he makes some slips in regard to Latinity and 'antiquities'. Such engaging Americanisms as 'he would have made the consulship' (245), 'a user of pure Latin' (259), 'it aims to enumerate orators' (319) do not displease; but 'our mutual activity' (*utriusque nostrum exercitatio*, 324), and 'both of whose speeches' (*quorum utriusque orationes*, 325) are difficult to condone.

In 59 there is the well-known quotation from Ennius in which editors usually read *Suadaeque medulla*. Our translator, following MS. authority, prefers *Suadai medulla*, but fails to explain how the phrase is to come into an hexameter line. *Livius primus fabulam docuit* (72) is translated 'Livius produced his first play', and a footnote indicates twice over that it was the first recorded play of the Roman theatre: why not write 'L. produced the first Roman play'? *Corculum* as a sobriquet of Scipio Nasica is (79, footnote) rendered 'the darling of the people'. Doubtless Plautus uses *corculum* as 'darling', but one can hardly disregard Cicero, *Tusc.* i. 18 and Fest. 61 as evidence for the meaning 'Wise-head' in this passage. *Quaestiones perpetuae* (106 and footnote) is 'the standing courts' not 'the standing court'. In

109, footnote, Mr. Hendrickson maintains that the MS. reading *facile agitavit in tribunatu* means 'he was successful in his tribuneship' [Lambinus read *facete agitavit* with C. Gracchum as object]; but *facile agitare* in *Vita Terenti* and *facile agere* in Terence *Adelphi* (to which appeal is made) only mean 'to live comfortably', a very different idea. 'How nothing ill-considered proceeded from his lips!' as an equivalent of *quam nihil non consideratum exibat ex ore!* (265) is an outrage on Latin and English idiom alike. Similarly (277) *cum essem argumentatus quantum res ferebat* 'pointing out how serious the accusation was' ought to be 'when I had stated all the arguments that the case presented'.

The worst misunderstanding occurs in 289: 'So then if to speak in a pinched and meagre way is Attic, why let them enjoy their title of Atticists. But let them come before a public assembly, let them speak before the people standing attentive in its capacity of judge. The benches call for a louder and fuller voice' (*sed in comitium veniant, ad stantem iudicem dicant; subsellia grandiorum et pleniorum vocem desiderant*). Our translator follows Kroll, who hastily concluded that *ad stantem iudicem* referred to the citizens *stantes in contione*, and thought of noisy proceedings in a *iudicium populi*. This would be pointless or ambiguous. Martha, never negligible, suggests a different view. The *Attici* are to come to the *comitium*, a confined and secluded spot, notable for its *tribunal praetoris*. They are to address a single judge—the praetor (says Martha), but he might conceivably be the *unus iudex* of *Orator* 72 and *De opt. gen.* 10 (important parallels). That single judge is not sitting on the tribunal, but hearing and answering informal applications *de plano*, i.e. extrajudicially. In modern terms 'let the neo-Atticists content themselves with addressing a judge "in chambers": they are not fit to plead in an important criminal trial'. Ciceronian venom indeed.

In *privatorum cupiditatibus* (329) probably refers to 'individuals', not to 'men in private station'. There are

misprints in 255 and 300; in 274 the words *longius ductum* are left untranslated; and there is a bad blemish of English construction at the end of 8.

But the compensations for these faults are numerous and weighty.

R. G. NISBET.

University of Glasgow.

A NEW EDITION OF CICERO, *DE DOMO SUA*

M. Tulli Ciceronis *De Domo Sua* ad Pontifices oratio. Edited by R. G. NISBET. Pp. xlv+232. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

WHEN there are school editions of Latin authors appearing which actually boast that the notes lay stress on subject-matter and relegate syntax to second place, it is a relief to find an editor who realizes that subject-matter can be neither known nor appreciated until the syntax has been understood. Mr. Nisbet's edition of the *De Domo* is much more than a school edition, and it is to be hoped that its outstanding merit will win sufficiently wide recognition for it to influence future editors.

The Introduction contains sections on the history of the years 63 B.C. to 56 B.C. and on Cicero's attitude towards religion, an analysis of the speech, and a discussion of its authenticity. Zielinski's analysis of the clausulae is quoted as a strong argument in favour of its genuineness. The historical section gives all that is required for a complete understanding of the circumstances under which the speech was delivered. The Introduction is followed by a table of dates, a short note on the important manuscripts, and a bibliography of most imposing length.

It is the Commentary, however, which is the most valuable part of the edition. No important syntactical point is left unexplained, the interpretation of no difficult passage is shirked. Great pains are taken to show the full force of a word or construction and to make clear all the connexions of thought. The exegesis is supported by a wealth of references to parallel passages and to authoritative modern works on Syntax, History, Literature, and Roman Antiquities. This is done with a scholarly judgement which will make the commentary valuable not only to students, but to older scholars and teachers. A

great deal about Ciceronian Latinity is to be learned from it.

However, it is not to be expected that, in a commentary of such length on a work containing as many difficulties as the *De Domo*, there are no decisions about which a difference of opinion is possible. The following might perhaps be mentioned.

§ 1. *religiones sapienter interpretando*. To one considering *utrum in alterum abiturum?* Klotz seems right in retaining *religionibus*. It is not quite correct to say that Löfstedt accepts the logical explanation given by Hofmann-Leumann. He regards the construction as due rather to illogical contamination (*Syntactica*, ii, p. 162).

§ 13. *ne in hanc tantam materiem . . . adhaeresceret*. Mr. Nisbet says 'Read *ne iniecta in hanc tantam . . .*: it is hardly safe to have *adhaerescere* with *in* and accusative.' It is tempting to ease the syntax in this way, but it was not impossible for Cicero to contaminate the ideas of 'impinging upon' and 'sticking to'.

§ 16. *non quo . . . imponerem . . . sed quia*. The subjunctive with *non quo*, when followed by *sed quia*, is more likely to be that of 'rejected reason' than 'final', despite Wilkins's note on *De Or.* i, 84. Wilkins himself admits that the former use of *quo* is commoner than the latter, when there is no comparative present. I.e. 'not that I was trying to shift the burden . . .'

§ 21. *Atque in hoc solum . . . detulisti*. Why do editors reject the united testimony of the manuscripts in this passage? Mr. Nisbet suggests *neque* (as Klotz) *in hoc solum . . . sed etiam in ipso Catone*. . . . He rightly rejects Peterson's *produceres*—*subduceres*, and puts a full stop after *subduxeras* instead. But if *solum* can be taken with what follows, instead of with *in hoc*, there is no need to tamper with the

text at all. To begin with, *neque in hoc . . .* is so natural a beginning to the sentence that it is hard to see why *neque* should have been corrupted into *atque*, and if *atque* is right, so is the explanatory *qui in ipso Catone . . .* In the second place, Cicero, having started to pile up his rhetorical relative clauses, is hardly likely to have stopped at *subduxeras*, and then begun a new period with more relative clauses. While granting that the pluperfects *produxeras*—*subduxeras* do refer to the same action as *detulisti*, and do not belong to the same argument as *obieceras*—*dixeras*, one can explain their tense as that sort of extra-past tense which is used of a past truth which has only subsequently been realized. The sense of the manuscript reading would then be somewhat as follows: 'And in this affair (i.e. in mentioning the Cyprus appointment) I am only convicting you of inconsistency (and am not now concerned with the wickedness of it), for (a further inconsistency was involved) in (your attitude to) Cato himself, whom (as it turns out) you had not advanced thereby (*in eo* <*negotio*>) as his worth deserved, but had removed to further your wicked schemes, your proposal expressly conferred an honourable and extraordinary command on the very man whom you had (previously) thrown as a prey to your Sergii' etc.

§ 37. *tribunum . . . se fieri non licere*. It might usefully have been pointed out in the note that there is a slight difference in sense between the dative and infinitive with *licet* and an accusative-and-infinitive phrase standing as subject.

§ 67. *domique continuerit. compegerit* is more likely to have been corrupted into *coniecerit* than either *continuerit* or Halm's *compulerit*. (This would require *domumque*, which is attested, while *domique* is not.)

§ 105. The use of the bare ablative *Hoc auctore tam casto . . . potestis . . . non commoueri . . .*? is worth a note.

§ 107. *nec est ulla . . . pietas si honesta . . . cum expeti . . . arbitrare* (sic codd.). Mr. Nisbet has a long and scholarly note on this passage, but once more he deals too freely with the text. He would read . . . *nisi honesta . . . opinio, ut expeti . . .*

arbitrere, and by substituting the amplifying *ut*-clause for the indicative *cum*-clause turns the sentence into a general definition of *pietas*. But he rightly follows Schöll in taking *ab iis* to mean 'by the gods' and not 'from the gods'. Probably all that is wrong with the manuscript reading is that *honesta* has caused *non est* to drop out by haplography. If this is inserted, the sentence can be literally translated: 'Nor is there any piety towards the gods, if one's idea of the divine will and mind is not creditable when one believes that nothing unjust or discreditable is being required by them.' In other words, 'One is not performing an act of piety, if one's belief that one's offering is acceptable to the gods is founded on a wrong interpretation of the divine will.' I.e. we have not here a general definition of *pietas*, but a more particular reference to Clodius' pretended act of piety. The mood in *cum . . . arbitrare* is not only 'not impossible' but necessary.

§ 119. *in eum . . . irruerit quem perculsum . . . extolleret*. The imperfect *extolleret* is not 'ingressive' or 'conative'. The distinction in tense between *irruerit* and *extolleret* is that which is usual in consecutive clauses. *irruerit* stresses the actuality of Clodius' attack, *extolleret* the close connexion between cause and effect, the inevitable result of the victim's character. The community would not so certainly come to the aid of a victim of different character, as Cicero goes on to say.

It will be seen from some of the above criticisms that, if the edition has a weakness at all, it is on the side of textual criticism. Where the united testimony of the important manuscripts gives a text which makes tolerable sense and is not un-Latin, it is dangerous to rewrite it, unless a most probable source of error can be shown. But these isolated criticisms must not be allowed to obscure the general excellence of the edition. Mr. Nisbet is a first-rate Ciceroian scholar, and he has done a good service to Latin scholarship. It is to be hoped that he will edit more.

ERIC C. WOODCOCK.

University of Manchester.

CATULLUS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

J. A. S. MCPEEK: *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain*. Pp. xvii+411. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Philology, 15.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 21s.

IN spite of its glamorous style and title this is a work of real learning which offers to the student of Catullus many unfamiliar parallels from English literature; Raleigh's *History of the World*, for instance, yields

The Sunne may set and rise:
But we contrariwise
Sleepe after our short light
One everlasting night

—an indubitable reference to Cat. v. 4-6; and though we may feel less confidence than Mr. McPeck that George Turberville in writing

On hir I gazde a whyle
till use of sense was fled:
And colour paper white before
was woxen Scarlet red.
I felt the kindled sparkes
to flashing flames to growe:
And so on sodaine I did loue
The Wight I did not knowe

'must have known Cat. li or some close imitation of it', it is pleasant to make the acquaintance of these charming verses.

M.'s purpose is to collect parallel passages, whether direct imitation of the Latin or imitations of imitations, down to the time of Pope. The authors he is chiefly concerned with are Skelton, whose *Phyllyp Sparowe* may or may not be connected with C.'s *passer*; Spenser, Cowley, Jonson, Donne, and Herrick; though few poets of the period escape mention. Some of these were men of learning who obviously or avowedly had C. in mind when they wrote; but the poems freely imitated were few, and their themes are mostly the common raw material of poets.

Accordingly it is often impossible to say whether a particular passage is derived from the Latin at first or second hand, or bears a merely fortuitous resemblance; further, there was a considerable amount of classically inspired poetry written in France and Italy on which English writers drew freely. On the whole M. shows commendable restraint in not claiming direct Catullan influence where there is no evidence for it, but like most of those who occupy themselves with sources he is too ready to assume that nothing is ever thought of twice; a few unpalatable claims are made, and space is wasted in denying C.'s influence where no one should have suspected it.

Really M. is less concerned with C. than with tracing the recurrence in English authors of certain themes which may have originated with C., such as the dead pet, the sun of life which will not rise again, the hate that mingles with love, and above all the imagery of the Epithalamium; the last provides material for the most elaborate chapter, and the image of the elm and the vine the most overpowering list of parallels filling five pages of notes.

Whether labours of this kind do much 'to set back the frontiers of darkness' is open to doubt; but if all workers in this field performed their task with as much zest the doubt would arise less often.

A few points of detail: No. 15 of the *Anacreontea* is referred to several times as a genuine work of Anacreon; 'the Ninth Idyll of Bion' should be Bion *Frag.* 8; the date of Metellus Celer's consulship was 60, not 80 B.C.; and passages of hexameters are rather tiresomely printed as though they were elegiacs and vice versa.

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

ICTUS AND WORD-ACCENT IN VIRGIL

W. F. JACKSON KNIGHT: *Accentual Symmetry in Vergil*. Pp. x+107. Oxford: Blackwell, 1939. Cloth, 6s.

MOST of the matter contained in this

breezily written little book was already known from Mr. Knight's earlier publications: viz. the expressional value of coincidence ('homodyne') and clash

('heterodyne') of ictus and word-accent in Virgil's hexameter, and the importance of the fourth foot, in which alternation of homodyne and heterodyne is stated to effect more or less elaborate patterns in successive lines ('fourth foot structure'). The express purpose of the author is to elucidate the more complicated of these patterns; another obviously is to challenge criticism, to which Mr. Knight's views have so far been but little subjected since they were not published in book form.

The expressional value of homodyne and heterodyne in general will not be discussed here. The necessary statistics will not be available till the day when some *chalkenteros* presents us with a work on a scale exceeding even that of H. Cornu's labours. Judgement on individual lines, however, as Mr. Knight well knows, remains subjective, and—a fact of which he seems less aware—it can be rather comical, as, e.g., in the following passage (p. 17, on *Aen.* iv. 386 'omnibus umbra locis adero'): 'The homodyne' (in the first two feet) 'means that the threat has everything its own way. Dido, near by, at the back of the dark, is to be escaped never. Then the rattling fury of her hate takes control. "lòcis àdero" are heterodyned. . . . The conflict of the heterodyne is a conflict between the vengeance Dido plans as a haunting ghost, and her infinitely greater will to vengeance more horrible still. Dido's self outruns her curse, and conflicts with it, because it is not enough.'

With fourth foot structure we are on safer ground, since Mr. Knight here makes use of the statistics furnished in his earlier work (the table at the end is reprinted from his article in *C.Q.* xxv, 1931, 184 ff.). We note with surprise that homodyne and heterodyne, which are held to be expressive of content (homodyne of speed, absence of restraint, concord, &c., heterodyne of strain, slowness, strife), should have the entirely different function of forming rhythmical patterns, and proceed to register Mr. Knight's various pattern schemes: *A.* Simple patterns: (1) Sequence of homodyne. (2) Sequence of heterodyne.

(3) Released movement, 'by far the most important and most characteristically Vergilian' pattern, consisting of from 7 to 11 heterodynes followed by one homodyne. (4) Alternation of heterodyne and homodyne (ababa), including (4a) Expanded alternation (abbabba, baabbaab, babbbaabba and the like). *B.* Complex patterns composed of simple patterns, these being either contiguous or shading into one another; examples:

Georg. ii. 161-76 aaab.ab.aaaab.abab; i.e. released movements and alternations.

Aen. vi. 426-49 aaab.baab.aaba.ab.ab.ba.b.abaaa

i.e. released movements, alternation, and expanded alternations.

Are these patterns due to some formative principle, or are they merely freaks? Mr. Knight's light-hearted reply 'if they are due to chance' (a possibility which he never seriously considers), 'they are just as nice as ever, just as Vergilian', &c., is quite misleading. If they are freaks they are neither particularly nice nor worthy to occupy our attention a minute longer, and since in a hundred Vergilian lines there are roughly 65 fourth foot heterodynes and 35 homodynes, freak constellations of homodyne and heterodyne would seem to stand an excellent chance.

How frequent, then, are the patterns? According to Mr. Knight's statistics, 14.32 per cent. of Virgil's lines are contained in alternations. Ennius, Lucilius, and Lucretius, we are informed, were too busy with metrical quantity to care about the subtleties of homodyne and heterodyne. And yet, according to the same statistics, 16-18 per cent. of Lucretius' lines belong to alternations. With regard to the released movement Virgil fares a little better: 15.75 per cent., as against Lucretius' 5.49; an explanation of this will be given below. For the other patterns statistics are not supplied; we must accept Mr. Knight's statement that many verses will be found not to form part of any pattern, despite the truly protean qualities of the complex patterns (see e.g. *Aen.* vi. 817-62, p. 77 f.), which, in so far as they blend into one another, disregard the natural

limits of the syntactical period which comprehend the simple patterns. In view of this I should like to draw attention to the following pattern (a for heterodyne, b for homodyne): aaaaa bbbb aaab aaab babababab, i.e. a sequence of heterodyne, a sequence of homodyne, and two released movements of equal length followed by an alternation. This is as 'neat, simple, breath-taking' a scheme as any Mr. Knight has pointed out, a catalogue, as it were, of the simple patterns; and yet it is only the first lines of *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* read in succession.

It would appear that Mr. Knight in pursuit of his discovery, which he sets forth with admirable skill, diligence, and enthusiasm, has not sufficiently considered the laws of probability. This is a common enough mistake, and one which sometimes does more good than harm. Less forgivable seems to me another shortcoming: utter disregard of what is, after all, the traditional theory. According to this, fourth foot heterodyne is nothing but hephthemimeral caesura, fourth foot homodyne, for all practical purposes, the absence of it. And a caesura—need the fact be stressed?—is a pause. Everybody will agree with Mr. Knight that there is a certain speed in

impus haec tam culta novalia miles habebit, a lack of restraint which may well symbolize 'hot-tempered indignation'. But this is due not to the absence of heterodyne, but to the absence of caesura or pause both from the third and fourth feet.

As to Virgil's predilection for the 'released movement', Mr. Knight is to

be congratulated on this observation, which he gladly acknowledges to have been to some extent anticipated by Conway. But again, its explanation is furnished by the caesura, and it is as simple as this: Virgil liked a period to roll out and come to rest in a long colon uninterrupted by hephthemimeral pause.

A final remark may serve to remove any doubt as to whether hephthemimeral caesura is caused by heterodyne or heterodyne by caesura. Mr. Knight makes much of the fact that fourth foot homodyne is much more frequent in 'divided lines' (i.e. in lines with punctuation at the penthemimeres) than in ordinary lines. With homodyne as the starting-point this fact is not easily explained. From the point of view of caesura, however, nothing is more natural. If I set a group of lines which have penthemimeral caesura and therefore may lack hephthemimeral, against another group which includes many lines lacking penthemimeral caesura and thus almost bound to have hephthemimeral, it is obvious that the former group will contain fewer lines with hephthemimeral caesura, or, in other words, more homodyned lines.

I cannot end this review without stating that I have derived much pleasure from reading Mr. Knight's book. Wrong though I believe his conclusions to be, he has many a fine observation, and, among many flights of fancy, many a wise remark. His lively appreciation of poetical beauty and his scintillating argument never fail to interest and to stimulate.

O. SKUTSCH.

University of Manchester.

A COMMENTARY ON LUCAN

M. Annaei Lucani *De Bello Civili*, Liber I. Edited by R. J. GETTY. Pp. lxvi+155. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 6s.

IN his introduction Mr. Getty has concentrated on matters not discussed, or not fully discussed, elsewhere—Lucan's accusation of his mother (he suggests that Suetonius' account may represent slanderous gossip), the first seven lines

of Book I (which he claims for Lucan), the hero of the poem (being a history, it need not have any), Lucan's historical authorities and his geographical knowledge. The last and longest section, in which he feels he is breaking new ground, deals with Lucan's rhetoric; after some remarks on the history of rhetorical teaching, he goes through the tropes and figures mentioned by

Quintilian and the later grammarians one by one, illustrating them by examples from Lucan and emphasizing their importance for his interpretation. Here he draws no distinction between figures common to all poetry, those common to all Latin poetry, and those common to a great part of Latin writing. Indifferent as Lucan's readers may be to rhetorical technique, they can hardly help recognizing the comparison of Caesar to a thunderbolt as 'hyperbole'; the reader will recognize the use of *miles* for *milites* and of *Tonanti* for *Iovi* as normal Latin idioms though he may not have labelled them 'synecdoche' and 'antonomasia'. The reflection that some of these so-called figures are used by Latin authors who knew little or nothing of rhetoric might make one wonder how far Quintilian's account is a formalization of unconscious practice. No attempt is made to compare Lucan's language, in the matter of figures, with earlier Latin verse on the one hand, or, on the other, with contemporary oratory; Mr. Getty cites the declamations twice in his notes, but on other points. Without such a comparison the catalogue is of little value, and Mr. G.'s absorption in the formal aspect of figures has led him into mistakes which would never have occurred to one who had a wider view of the language. 282 *par labor atque metus pretio maiore petuntur* was rejected by Housman 'through failure', as Mr. G. says, 'to understand its meaning'. To one who has hypallage and *e sequentibus praecedentia* at his command, there is no difficulty. *Par* means 'no greater', and so 'probably less', and the phrase is equivalent to *pari labore atque metu maius petitur pretium*. Housman was 'unconscious of the hypallage', and unaware that in Latin one could say *labor pretio petitur* when one meant *pretium labore petitur*. Hypallage is invoked again at 676 *attonitum rapitur matrona per urbem*, where the epithet 'may be an instance of hypallage (= *attonita*)': only as a third possibility does Mr. G. allow that the poet may have meant exactly what he said. 427-8 *Arvernique ausi Latio se fingere fratres | sanguine ab Iliaco*

populi is another hypallage and Housman was wrong in taking *populi* as nominative. It may indeed be genitive, but, if it is, it represents *Arvernorum*, and Housman declined to interpret the phrase as *a sanguine Iliaci populi* not, as Mr. G. implies, because he forgot Virg. *A.* 8. 526 and Hor. *C.* 1. 12. 34, but because he remembered them. 240-1 *deripuit . . . arma quae pax longa dabat* has always been translated 'such arms as a long peace supplied'. No, says Mr. G.; that would need *dedit: dabat* stands for *perdebat* and may be an instance of simple verb for compound, which the wise classify as synecdoche. That this is so 'is clear' (a) from the description of Pompey below as *longa pace solutus* and (b) 'from the fact that lengthy duration of time naturally has the effect of destroying (*perdere*)'. Admirable logic; but has Mr. G. never wondered how a language in which one could without warning use a verb meaning 'provide' in the sense of 'destroy' survived as a vehicle of human communication? Mr. G.'s enthusiasm has also obscured for him the fact that a Latin poet is writing within a framework of grammar, which he cannot completely flout if he is to be intelligible. In a passing reference to Hor. *C.* 1. 6. 1-2, *scriberis Vario*, Mr. G. accepts Servius' testimony that *Vario* is dative and explains *alite* as 'the ablative for the dative, in other words the figure *antiptosis*'; the difficulty of an ablative in apposition to a dative does not trouble him. At 98 *temporis angusti* is described as a 'detached genitive'; but it is the very function of a genitive to be attached. The reader will not be misled, but he may be perplexed, when he finds *vobis auctoribus* (454) appearing as a figure, 'noun for participle'; does Mr. G. think that an ablative absolute must properly have a participle and that *te duce* is figured, *te ducente* plain, or that when Plautus said *me suasore* he had got it from the rhetoricians of Sarsina?

The commentary is very full, and Mr. G. has brought some new material to it, in particular parallels from Ovid. Its weakness lies in an insensitivity to

language which has already appeared in the introduction. There (p. lxiii) he quotes with approval the description of Virg. *A.* 3. 359-60 *qui numina Phoebi, qui tripodas, Clarii laurus, qui sidera sentis* as a zeugma and Mr. A. J. Bell's paraphrase of *sentis* by *suscipis* . . . *nosti . . . peritus es*; it would be more useful to relate the meanings of *sentire* than to distinguish them. Here are a few examples of various kinds from the notes: 131 'petitor: used in the literal sense of "a seeker after"' (what other sense has it?); 186 '*ingens, clara, maestissima, and effundens* are all parallel'; 105 *Assyrias* is 'the compound for the simple adjective'; 239 *stratis* 'originally means "bed-coverings" (Lucr. 4. 849 *mollia strata*), then, as here, "beds" by synecdoche'; 131 *dedidit ducem*, 'supply *esse* or *se praestare*. It is also likely that *ducem* is an instance of the concrete for the abstract and = "leadership"'. 'Forget his leadership' is our idiom, *dediscere ducem* is Latin: that does not justify one in saying that *ducem* = 'leadership'. The tendency to think of Latin in terms of English, a common failing, appears again and again; sometimes one might think that Mr. G. is commenting on Duff's translation, not on Lucan. There are three notes on *-que*: 134 '*-que*: the enclitic has the force of *sed*' (what he means is that Latin, in certain circumstances, uses *et* or *-que* where we should use 'but'); 252 '*-que*: "or"'; 682 '*-que*: "when"'. An extreme instance occurs on 462 *et ignavum rediturae parcere vitae*: 'for this omission, not unnatural after *mens*, of a verb of thinking, compare such instances of the accusative and infinitive of exclamation as the well-known example in Virg. *A.* 1. 37-8'. This is the school-boy's way of looking at things. On 683 *primos ortus* he says 'the epithet *primos* appears to be otiose, unless perhaps it is used for the adverb *primum*'; 'first' would be otiose in English, no doubt, but knowledge of the common idioms *prima origo, primum initium, supremus finis* and the like should have saved Mr. G. from passing this judgement on Lucan's use of his native tongue. (What would Mr. G. reply to a Hottentot who

told him that, when he says 'face the matter squarely' (p. xlvii), 'squarely' is otiose?) So on 322 *medias perrumpere leges*, 'an otiose epithet, which serves merely as a metrical eke': for the emphatic *medius* see Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.* ii. 540. (The opinion here implied of Lucan as a versifier appears elsewhere. 351 '*dominos*: plural for singular, probably, with reference to Pompey, because *dominum* is metrically inconvenient for this line'; or, more bluntly, p. liv '*dominos*, where the singular . . . would not scan'. The line is *detrahimus dominos urbi servire paratae*: poor Lucan!) On 115 *maiores (in luce moras)* we read: "'longer". The meaning of the word must be understood from its context'; in 102 *terra* is 'an example of the noun for the pronoun'. On the usage of words, too, Mr. G. is an unsafe guide. *conquerimur* (362) is not "'we all complain" (*con-*), nor is *contorsit* (575) 'helped to throw': and the two translations offered for *improbis* ('unsatisfied' 334, 'incessantly' 629) miss the point of the adjective. Few will agree with him that *summi numinis instar* (199) means 'like Cybele'; there is more to be said for his suggestion that *in turbam missi* (86) means 'launched against the populace'. At 163 he takes *auro tectisve* as hendiadys, 'the gold with which the ceilings of their dwellings were decorated'; the simple view that the words mean 'plate or mansions', two obvious fields for extravagance, is not mentioned. In the novel opinion that *invisis gentibus* (9) means 'envious barbarian nations' Mr. G. overreaches himself: *donanda vitia sunt, non portenta*.

Sometimes this linguistic uncertainty has serious consequences. The worst is at 259: '*quantum*: sc. *est*, so that *cum* embraces not only *coercet* but also *silent* and *tacet*'. A pretty piece of Latin: *tanta est quies quantum est cum bruma volucres coercet, rura silent, tacet pontus*. At 234 *seu sponte deum seu* he rejects Housman's change of *seu* to *sed* as unnecessary. He may be right; but he goes on to misunderstand *singularis* in Housman's note, dismisses as 'arbitrary' Housman's distinction between

this passage and 5. 136 (there both *seu*-clauses have a verb; here one has not) and concludes 'Translate, then: "But whether by the will of Heaven"'. Housman's objection to *seu* (which Mr. G. does not conceal) was the asyndeton: the simple expedient of translating a *sed* which was not there had not occurred to him. At 101 Mr. G. prefers *male* to *mare*, accepted by Housman, and reads *undas qui secat et geminum gracilis male separat Isthmos / nec patitur conferre fretum*, explaining that *undas* is object of all three verbs: in that case the remarkable hyperbaton *geminum . . . fretum* seems to need more support than the two passages (5. 680-1 and 7. 685-6) which he cites.

The note on 128, 'As Haskins observes, the Stoics did not hesitate to place their "wise men" (*sapientes*) such as Cato on the same footing as the gods', merely blunts the point of Lucan's best epigram.

A critical apparatus follows the commentary. Mr. Getty has examined, or re-examined, the Paris MSS., and some of his variations from Housman's text are based on the evidence of the *dete-*

riores—18 *Scythicum glaciali*, 54 *adversi*, 229 *it*. At 304 he reads *transcenderet*, at 481 *tunc*, at 615 *nigrum*, at 623-4 with van Jever *iacet . . . latet*: at 681 his own conjecture *quot* takes from the force of *Romanae* and leaves the second half of the sentence in the air.

In appendixes Mr. G. reiterates his views on some passages (15, 72-7, 313, 444) which he had already discussed in *C.Q.* (xxx, p. 55). Being one of those feeble creatures, properly condemned by Quintilian and Mr. G., who, finding their hands full enough with Latinity, have not made themselves competent astronomers, I leave the technical issues on which Dr. Semple has engaged him (*C.Q.* xxxi, p. 16); but the confidence with which, sweeping aside Bentley, Housman, and Dr. Fraenkel, he proposes in 74-5 *omnia mixtis sidera sideribus concurrent ignea* excites my ignorant surprise. He does not translate the phrase, so I must try to do it: 'all the fiery stars will collide with the stars which are partly fiery and partly something else'. Well, perhaps that is good astronomy.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

A COMMENTARY ON CLAUDIAN

Claudians Festgedicht auf das sechste Konsulat des Kaisers Honorius, herausgegeben und erklärt von Karl Albert MÜLLER. Pp. 131. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM. 6.

SINCE the Renaissance the poet Claudian has never lacked readers attracted by his intrinsic merit or by his historical importance; and he has been well served by his editors, by N. Heinsius in the seventeenth century, by Gesner in the eighteenth, and last century by Birt in his critical edition for the *M.G.H.* Our own generation has seen a continuation of the interest, first by the publication in France of M. Fargues's study *Claudian: Sa poésie et son temps*, followed by his edition of *In Rufinum*, then from America by Mr. H. L. Levy's edition of *In Rufinum* with historical and philological notes, and now by a German commentary (largely exegetical,

but partly historical, and in a minor degree critical) on the Sixth Consulship of Honorius. This work by Mr. Müller seems to me the best commentary on any part of Claudian since the more comprehensive but less detailed edition by Gesner: it is particularly to be recommended to the notice of translators, whose treatment of Claudian has always been, and continues to be, smoothly unscientific.

Mr. Müller is more concerned with exegesis than with textual criticism. He adopts Birt's text with occasional changes which are discussed in the notes. A clearer indication of these variants would have been better, as the notice of them is obscured by the other material. The commentary is adequate, clear, and generally sound in exposition and illustration. Peculiarities of grammar, expression, and style are carefully marked. The editor knows his Claudian

and the Silver Age poets whom Claudian imitated, and he makes good use of apt and pertinent parallels—reminding me of Heinsius' method, 'vocatis ad partes eis scriptoribus . . . qui aut ad aevum Claudiani proximi accederent aut quos familiares atque in deliciis illi praecipue fuisse ex ipsa imitatione liquido appareret'. The historical events which form the background of the poem but which Claudian's propaganda so often hides or distorts are briefly discussed in the light of modern investigation. The pity is that so much good material has been left at random in the notes: to be of proper service the book needs an index rerum et verborum: none of the older editors ever omitted such an indispensable convenience.

In about a score of passages I differ from Mr. Müller, but here I have space to mention only a few:

(a) 361 ff. 'dissimulata diu tristes in amore repulsas | vestra parens, Auguste, queror.' I cannot agree with Gesner, who takes *dissimulata* ('Graecismo eleganti', as he says) with *tristes repulsas*; nor can I take it closely with *vestra parens* as Mr. Müller wishes, 'deren Eigenschaft als eure Mutter lange verleugnet wurde'. Birt is much more probably right in interpreting *dissimulata* as *neglecta*, a usage which becomes not infrequent in this later Latin. Cf. xviii. 176 'iam iam dissimulat dominos'. *queror* will now govern *repulsas* as direct accusative. This sense of *dissimulata* suits *responsa morandi* (356), *differri longius non passa* (357), and *cunctantem* (360).

(b) 491 ff. 'Exere nunc doctos tantae certamine laudis, | Roma, choros.' Mr. Müller here regards *tantae laudis* as genitive with *doctos* and *certamine* as meaning *certatim*. But this is an awkward division of a phrase which by position and rhythm is a unity: surely the sense is 'trained in a competitive rivalry to achieve, or to express, a glory so great' as Silicho's. Cf. xxvi. 492 'per tot certamina docto . . . seni'; and Cic. *Off.* i. 38 'certamen honoris et dignitatis'. Nor do I see any advantage in the alternative *certamina* which Gesner takes as in apposition with *choros* and Birt as

accusative after *doctos*: neither of these devices appears to give a tolerable sense.

(c) 543 ff. 'omne Palatino quod pons a colle recedit | Mulvius in quantum licuit consurgere tectis, | una replet turbae facies.' Birt followed by Mr. Müller takes *quod* as *quoad*, which is untranslatable. The *quod* is the neuter of the relative subjoined to an intransitive verb to denote the extent of the action. Cf. xv. 158 'quod Nilus et Atlas | dissidet, occiduis quod Gadibus arida Barce | . . . secedit, . . . hoc sibi transcripsit proprium'. So I translate 'The full extent of the distance by which the Mulvian Bridge is separated from the Palatine Hill'. But Claudian expresses the size of the crowd in two dimensions, length and height: they extend along the road and they swarm up the houses. Both clauses *omne quod recedit* and *quantum licuit consurgere tectis* are objects of *replet*: therefore I reject Mr. Müller's *in quantum* and retain the more usual *et quantum*, translating 'the fullest height attainable on the houses'. This concert well with what follows, ll. 545-6, 'undare videres | ima viris, altas effulgere matribus aedes'. The phrase *una . . . turbae facies* suggests to Mr. Müller an appearance of gaiety: 'die Menge, die das gleiche (frohe) Aussehen hat'. But *turbae* is a defining genitive with *facies*, and the meaning is 'the only aspect which the whole distance presented was *turba*, a mass of humanity'. Cf. Pliny, *Panegy.* 51. 4, 'per omne spatium una facies, omnia continua et paria'.

(d) 608 ff. 'munere carior omni | obstringit sua quemque salus. procul ambitus erret: | non quaerit pretium, vitam qui debet, amori.' Punctuating thus, Mr. Müller renders, 'Der sucht nicht für seine Liebe eine Belohnung, der sein Leben (dem Kaiser) verdankt'. But is *quaerere pretium amori* a possible Latin construction in this sense? Is not the genitive *amoris* required? Cf. x. 142 'pretium non vile laboris . . . habebis'. Birt and the earlier editors read 'non quaerit pretium, vitam qui debet amori': 'he seeks no fee (as a claqueur) who owes his life to the Emperor's love'. This arrangement is more in accord with Claudian's practice of using *debere*, in

this sense, with the accusative and dative. Cf. xxiv. 77 'populi vitam debere fatetur | armis Roma tuis'. Mr. Müller rejects the older punctuation because it gives 'einen allzu trivialen Sinn': but it is not an editor's business to elevate the author's sentiments at the expense of his Latinity.

It is now just half a century since the appearance of Birt's Claudian, and this vast edition for a century to come will be the basis of all work on these poems. But it is no disparagement of Birt to say that he still leaves room for much critical investigation. His own judgement is not always sound: his choice of

readings is sometimes determined by a misapprehension of the sense: his emendations are sometimes unnecessary and sometimes patently wrong: the exegetical notes interspersed in his *app. crit.* and in his indices are often misguided. The revision of Birt by a series of critical and exegetical editions covering the poems one by one is a task to which Mr. Müller's book opportunely points the way, and to which Latin scholarship, when this war is ended, might well address itself as a work of peace.

W. H. SEMPLÉ.

University of Manchester.

A SHORT HISTORY OF GREEK AND LATIN

D. S. CRAWFORD: *Greek and Latin*. An Introduction to the Historical Study of the Classical Languages. Pp. vi+331. Cairo: Fouad I University (Cambridge: Heffer). 1939. Paper, 5s.

It is true to say that the study of Comparative Philology in this country suffers from the lack of a sufficiently cheap text-book in English on the comparative grammar of Latin and Greek. Apart from Giles's *Manual* (now out of print and somewhat out of date) the most convenient book is Buck's rather expensive *Comparative Grammar of Latin and Greek*. Mr. Crawford (who does not even mention Buck) now provides at a moderate price a text-book which he hopes will meet the requirements of classical students generally as well as of those who are entering upon the special study of Comparative Philology. His aim is 'rather to interest the student than to give a complete and exhaustive account'. He contrives, however, to cover a very wide field and on some subjects enters into considerable detail. The publishers are certainly to be congratulated on the modesty of the price at which they present so much material.

Before starting upon the details of Phonology and Morphology to which the major portion of the book is devoted, Mr. Crawford discusses at some length the early history of the 'Wiros', the degree to which linguistic and archaeo-

logical data can throw light on the pre-separation period, hypotheses about the entry of Indo-European language into the Balkan and Italian peninsulas, as well as general linguistic principles and the nature of phonetic law. It would be too much to expect a treatment of syntax as well: yet surely, when classifying (on p. 19) the changes which languages undergo, he should not have omitted to mention a department so important.

In his introductory discussions Mr. Crawford offers much that is instructive and interesting. In particular, the theory that comparison of the daughter languages takes us back not to a unified parent language but only to a linguistic continuum of related dialects will nowadays meet with general approval. When dealing, however, with the introduction of I.E. language into Italy and Greece, he would, I think, have done better by giving us a more adequate list of recent authorities: a book expressly intended for English readers should surely contain a reference to Myres's *Who were the Greeks?* and Whatmough's *The Foundations of Italy*. In the case of Italy he cites (apparently with approval) Giles's suggestion that, because Sicel seemed a Q dialect of Italic, the Latins and Faliscans reached their historical position from the south. Modern theory inclines rather to the belief that Sicel had no connexion with Italic except by

borrowing and by common heritage from Indo-European. Doubtless he is right in holding that I.E. speech was first introduced by the builders of the Terremare (this and not 'Terramare' is the accepted plural), but views about the character and importance of these settlements have recently undergone very considerable modification (see Randall-MacIver in *Antiquity*, xiii. 320).

In his account of Phonology and Morphology there is room for rather frequent criticism on points of detail. He promises 'to avoid dogmatic statement where doubt is justifiable' and on most occasions fulfils his promise. Sometimes, however, explanations which are against the weight of authority are offered as though they were unquestioned and nothing is said of rival and more popular theories. This applies to the statement that μέλισσα/μέλιττα represents the normal development of τ or $\theta + \iota$ and that μέσος and, presumably, ὄσος and ῥόσος are irregular; that -em in acc. of Latin -i- stems is a phonetic development of -im; that -a in 1st sg. perf. is from η . Some assertions lack either accuracy or fullness. His rule for Latin (p. 143) that 'Double consonants were simplified after a long

vowel or diphthong' is clearly insufficient for ll (e.g. mille, villa): avertō and sursum (p. 146) should be derived not from abvorto and subvorsum but from abzvorto and subzvorsum; there is no mention of the 4th decl. dative represented by manu, and only indirect mention of the prevailing theory that the ablative in -e of consonantal stems was a locative; δύνη is apparently accepted (p. 243) as the normal 2nd sg. of δύναμαι, and πῆχης and πῆχῃ are cited as actual forms; in his treatment of aorists he should say something about the type ἔχεα; on p. 306 he rightly refers to the difficulty presented by 3rd sg. ἦν, but it is quite useless to discuss the matter without reference to the older form ἦεν.

These criticisms do not affect my belief that this work will prove very useful as an introduction to the subject and even as a text-book if it be used with caution. It would certainly be much improved by a fuller reference to authorities where divergent views are in the field, and, particularly, by a bibliography more adequate than the very short one actually provided.

J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

GREEK PHONOLOGY AND MORPHOLOGY

E. SCHWYZER: *Griechische Grammatik*. 2te Lieferung: Wortbildung und Flexion. (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* II. i. 1. 2.) Pp. xlvii, 415-842. Munich: Beck, 1939. Paper, RM. 25.

CLASSICAL scholars and philologists will be grateful to Professor Schwyzler for the self-denying labour which has now provided them with an exhaustive account of the phonology and morphology of the Greek language. It is all the more regrettable that his work has been robbed for some time to come of much of its usefulness by the postponement of the index until the completion of the syntax. The reviewer, too, being deprived of an essential instrument of analysis, must confine his appraisalment to a few isolated points.

Misprints are few: on p. 580² for 669,

1a read 659, 1a; on p. 454 read zolataja for zo otaja; the reference on p. 615 to p. 555 for the Homeric δου, ἔης should be to p. 104; on p. 659⁵ the reference to Lang. 12. 173 is wrong and I cannot correct it; on p. 738 for 'σ(σ) für ξ . . .' read 'ξ für σ(σ) . . .'; on p. 785. 5 read -ῖω for -ῖω.

The treatment of the composition suffixes omits a discussion of the Hellenistic formations in which the suffixes -ιος, -ειος, and -αιος play an increasingly important part (e.g. τετραβόλειος, διδραχμαῖος, &c., the classical equivalents of which have no distinguishing suffix). On p. 655 Hellenistic εἰσωνον is regarded as evidence for the length of augmented ῖ-: how can this be so when this period was distinguished by a leveling of the quantities? In the discussion of the endings of the third-person plural active the analogical schemata seem

unnecessarily complicated. $\dot{\iota}\alpha\sigma\iota$ is said to be an analogical form substituted for $*\dot{\iota}\nu\tau\iota$ or $*\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\iota$ and modelled on $*\dot{\eta}\alpha\nu$, just as $\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\iota$ 'they are' was formed from $*\dot{\eta}\alpha\nu$ 'they were'. I find this difficult to follow. Once Greek *Sprachgefühl* had pluralized $-\alpha\tau\iota$ ($-\eta\tau\iota$) to $-\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ (as later Attic substituted $-\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ for $-\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$), then, given series like $\phi\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$: $\phi\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}$, $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$: $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\iota$, it was easy to form $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ on $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\iota$, $*\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ on $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, and $*\tau\dot{\iota}\theta\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ on $\tau\dot{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. There is ample evidence that the Greeks felt such personal inflexions as substitutable elements (see *I.F.* 53, 274 ff.). That it is wrong to make the imperfect the source of the analogies is proved by $\dot{\iota}\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota$, $\dot{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu$, where the source of the stem form $\dot{\iota}\sigma-$ is to be found in the present tense $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon$, for $*\dot{\iota}\delta\tau\epsilon$. It follows that $\dot{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu$ has been formed from $*\dot{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$, which itself derives from $\dot{\iota}\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ in the way described above. The treatment of the imperative (p. 804) refers to modern Greek forms in $-a$ such as $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi a$, but no mention is made of Hellenistic forms such as $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi a$ (P. Mey. 22, 9), which is a back-formation from $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi a\tau\epsilon$.

A point of some importance is the inflexion of the second-person singular primary active. S. holds to the doctrine that this was $-\sigma\iota$ in Greek, and he persists in regarding $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\varsigma$ 'thou art' as an analogical transformation of $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda$ ($*\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\iota$), disregarding the fact that $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\varsigma$ is preserved in a few formal phrases in our most archaic texts, 19 times out of 20 before a vowel, that $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda$ is not enclitic, and that an I.-E. sound-law has to be invented to account for the change of $*\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\iota$ to $*\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\iota$. The facts would indicate that $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\varsigma$ is not an analogical innovation but an archaic form preserved like $Z\eta\eta$ before a vowel, and that it is a graphic rendering of an original $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau$ ($E\Sigma$) which poetic tradition preserved in a few passages as a long syllable. If this is true, then the only Greek example of a primary $-\sigma\iota$ disappears. Both $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau$ and $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda$ (Hesiod) are old forms exhibiting the primary ending $-\sigma$, which appears everywhere else in Greek ($\tau\dot{\iota}\theta\eta\sigma$, &c.); $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\iota$ is a transformation of $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau$, while Attic $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda$ is an imperatival form $*\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau$.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

VERBAL ASPECTS AND COMPOUND VERBS IN GREEK

J. BRUNEL: *L'aspect verbal et l'emploi des préverbes en grec, particulièrement en attique*. Pp. 296. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris—XLV.) Paris: Klincksieck, 1939. Paper, 90 fr.

THIS book deals with the determinate and indeterminate aspects of the Greek verb. It will be remembered that, e.g., $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, 'explain', is determinate (depicting an activity with a contemplated consummation), $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon$, 'say on', is indeterminate. As in these instances, the difference is often a matter of vocabulary. As a mode of expressing the aspect by distinction of form, suffixes and similar formative variations in Greek (with a few exceptions, e.g., $\dot{\iota}\sigma\chi\omega/\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega$) have been superseded, as the author shows, by the prepositional compound, e.g. $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\rho\omega\dot{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\omega$. In the event, he demonstrates the normal distinction between simple and compound perfects. The present manifestly admits either

determinate or indeterminate stems. The aorist is more difficult to analyse: since it implies a $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\eta}$, it has a well-recognized association with the determinate aspect, which implies a $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (if the point may be so put); this the author confirms by detailed statistics of the *Ajax* and *Lysias* vii. But, by citing some *indeterminate* aorists, he shows that the distinction Indeterminate/Determinate is *not* parallel to the distinction Present/Aorist.

The main body of the book (chs. i-vi, pp. 22-252) contains an exceedingly subtle, yet lucid, examination of the semantic force and the aspect of prepositional compounds, in contrast to their simple verbs, with a wealth of (translated) quotations and supplementary references, mainly from Attic. The chief sections are on $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$, $\delta\iota\alpha$ (conative and intensive); $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ (ingressive and transitive); $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$, $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\sigma$, $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$, $\sigma\upsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$, $\delta\iota\alpha$, (denot-

ing results); ἀπο-, ἐκ- (denoting not, as might have been expected, a *terminus a quo*, but a *terminus ad quem*): ch. vi finally elucidates the pure determinate aspect, isolated from intensive force or concrete prepositional meaning, best seen in the semantic categories exemplified by (καθ)όρω, (κατ)αίσχύνομαι, (κατ)αμνθάνω. Besides the difficulty of translation the author recognizes that Greek itself is apt to neglect, abuse, or confuse its resources in this matter. Nowhere are facts strained to suit a theory. On the contrary, the only misleading statement I find is the express mention of ἐπιτηρεῖν in *Ach.* 197 as unique in meaning in Aristophanes. It does not there mean 'préparer', and in fact accords well with the other citations (p. 71), and with the author's thesis.

In a recent perusal of Liddell and

Scott I noted 3,970 verbs, neither poetical nor abstrusely technical, but such as might appear in the usual academic Attic prose exercise. No less than 30 per cent. of these were prepositional compounds of 76 common verbs (with 10 to 38 apiece), and, in all, such compounds formed just under 75 per cent. of the 3,970. After reasonable allowance for errors of all sorts these figures may yet serve to emphasize the importance of the compound verb in Greek, a fact perhaps too obvious to receive much notice. Both for its subject, therefore, and for the quality of the treatment, the present work is to be commended not only to the specialist but to everyone whose business it is to read Greek.

There is an index of the over 750 verbs discussed. P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

VISIGOTHIC SCRIPT

MSS. 27 (S. 29) and 107 (S. 129) of the Municipal Library of Autun, a Study of Spanish Half-uncial and Early Visigothic Minuscule and Cursive Scripts, by R. P. ROBINSON. (*Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. XVI.) Pp. ix+87; 73 plates. New York: American Academy in Rome, 1939. Portfolio.

THE interest of this book is purely palaeographical, and of all branches of Latin palaeography that dealing with Visigothic scripts concerns the classical scholar least: they are indeed the vehicle of Isidore's *Etymologies*, but of practically no classical author: Villada mentions only a Terence in his list of 219 MSS. Further, there are few Visigothic books in England, fourteen, nearly all from Silos, in the British Museum, one of the late Mr. Yates Thompson's, three in the Rylands, none apparently in Bodley, just a leaf at Cambridge. Cincinnati with Burnam and Robinson has been the foreign home of Iberian palaeography.

But it was time that the work on Visigothic begun by Professor E. A. Lowe in his *Studia Palaeographica* was carried further, and Professor Robinson makes Autun 27 the text for a revalua-

tion of all the earliest examples of these scripts. Its 76 folios fall into three parts; I, ff. 1-15, in VIII c. Merovingian minuscule and II, ff. 16-62, in Visigothic half-uncial contain most of Isidore, *Questions on the Hexateuch, Judges, and Kings*; III, ff. 73-6, in Visigothic minuscule, is a fragment of some commentary on Genesis. II and III are assigned to the middle of the VII c. (previous writers have said VIII c.), and each is claimed as the earliest example of its class. Additions in two varieties of Visigothic cursive are dated only a little later than the first hands and declared the first examples of the cursive. Other additions are called minuscule of the early VIII c. and (f. 63= Pl. 27) cursive Visigothic of the same: this last has generally been regarded as Merovingian; perhaps it comes from a borderland; anyway, it seems to me too regular and elegant to count as a mere cursive.

The cipher note on f. 21^r reads *conspiciens*.

The other MS., Autun 107, containing Augustine on Ps. cxli-cxlix in a splendid half-uncial written c. 600 in Spain or the French part of the Visigothic kingdom, has been brought in a little as an

afterthought for the sake of its many marginal notes in Visigothic cursive securely dated by the mention of Bishop Nambadus, who was martyred in 731.

The author allots thirty-nine plates to No. 27 and sixteen to No. 107: he then gives for comparison and discussion specimens of other Visigothic MSS.: Vat. Reg. Lat. 1024, *Leges Visigothorum*, often thought the earliest specimen of Visigothic half-uncial, c. 700; Verona lxxxix, *Lib. Orationum*, before 732, hitherto reckoned the first Visigothic minuscule; Esc. R. 11. 18, *Isidoriana*, *R. Festus*, *It. Anton.*, VII c. uncial with Visigothic additions formerly put down

to 778, but dated here in IX c. (Steffens², 35a); Monte Cassino 4 and 19, and besides these, unfamiliar specimens of Ravenna papyri. Further, three IX c. charters from León and Seo de Urgel, supporting our author's division of Visigothic cursive into that found in books, which he calls Mozarabic and gives to the Spaniards under Arab rule, and Leonese, found in charters, from independent Spain.

Everyone concerned with 'National Hands' will have to take account of this book, and for Visigothic it is of capital importance.

ELLIS H. MINNS.

Cambridge.

ARIADNE

J. MEERDINK: *Ariadne*. Een onderzoek naar de oorspronkelijke beteekenis en de ontwikkeling der Godin. Pp. 142. Wageningen: Veenman en Zonen, (1939?). Paper.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation, and, like most Dutch compositions of its kind, it has considerable merit. Dr. Meerdink spends a good deal of ingenuity, no small learning (a curious gap in his reading is Deubner's *Attische Feste*, which would have saved him one or two slips in details), and stout common-sense in seeking for the Cretan goddess who, as generally agreed, underlies the tale, half saga and half *Märchen*, of Ariadne and Theseus. He comes to the conclusion that she was a chthonian deity of the fertility of the ground, comparable to the May Queens of later times (it may be doubted if he is always justified in the parallels he draws; I should hesitate, for instance, to see any connexion between the garland Theseus fetches from under the sea and the May Queen's crown, pp. 44 ff.). As such, it is natural enough that she should be married, whether to Theseus (or whatever figure preceded that faithless or forgetful lover) or to Dionysos, concerning whose cult the author holds

views which the reviewer cannot always agree with. It is equally natural that she should die in giving birth to a child, in her Amathusian rite; though here again Dr. Meerdink perhaps goes too far in accepting the tale as we have it as representing the original cult-myth. Ought not the child to be born, if it is the offspring of a goddess of fertility, a sort of local Plutos? Aphrodite is here a secondary figure, whose influence is to be seen mainly in the young man enacting the rôle of the divine mother; young men are not uncommon in Aphrodite's service from Phaethon onwards. The ritual has nothing whatever to do with either couvade or mother-right (here the author is certainly correct), pp. 106 ff. Minos is hardly more than an indication of the date at which the fairy-tale princess is supposed to have lived, p. 69.

That assuming the dress of the other sex is necessarily a fertility-rite (pp. 117 ff.) is a doubtful assumption. On p. 124 the Hyperborean *περφερέες* are confused with the Athenian messengers to Delos. There are rather too many misprints, some very bad.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

MASTERPIECES OF GREEK PAINTING

G. MÉAUTIS: *Les Chefs-d'Œuvre de la Peinture grecque*. Pp. 220; 2 coloured plates, 72 photogravures. Paris: Albin Michel, 1939. Paper, 50 fr.

'IL n'existe, en français, aucun ouvrage quelque peu récent sur la peinture antique.' So M. Méautis wrote this book, but it is difficult to see why it took quite

this form. It is not a collection of texts, yet more than a third deals with artists no trace of whose works survives except in literary references. M. Méautis's account of the wall-paintings in the Lesche of the Cnidians may make better reading than Pausanias, but Pausanias had seen the things. The rest of the book, dealing largely with actual remains, is more reasonable, but even here there seems a false conception. 'Nous avons l'espoir', writes M. Méautis again in his preface, 'd'être parvenu à montrer que la peinture antique n'est en rien inférieure à la peinture moderne.' What a hope! Some capable mosaicists worked at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and some painters who could produce pleasant decorative work: but the figure paintings, whether original or adapted from earlier masterpieces, are almost without exception miserable hackwork, and what survives in Rome is on much the same level. It depresses the reputation of Greek art undeservedly to trumpet stuff like this as fit to stand beside the best of architecture and sculpture. M. Méautis's selection, how-

ever, is good, and puts the best face possible on the material. His individual appraisements are often interesting, and he can at times make one believe in the quality of an Athenion or a Timomachus behind the work one sees. His assumption that the better of two versions must always be the more faithful copy is sympathetic but hardly safe. He ends with a short essay on 'balance' as the ruling principle of Greek painting, regulating alike composition and the choice of subject: in particular the taste for representing a pregnant moment in which a whole story is implied. This is rather thin: if one knows a story, practically any moment one likes to choose in it becomes pregnant with implication; and composition in any art is based on balance. The illustrations are neither better nor worse than those in most French art-books; but, on the other side, the book is much more pleasant to read than would be a work of the same quality by a German or an Englishman.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

British Museum.

ANCIENT FINANCE

Charles Jesse BULLOCK: *Politics, Finance, and Consequences*. A study of the relations between politics and finance in the ancient world with special reference to the consequences of sound and unsound policies. (Harvard Economic Studies, 65.) Pp. viii + 212. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, \$2.50 or 10s. 6d.

PROFESSOR BULLOCK is an acknowledged authority on public finance; the Harvard Economic Studies include a number of monographs of fundamental importance to the economic theorist and the economic historian. It is to be regretted, therefore, that this first volume in the series to be devoted to the ancient world is little to the credit of its eminent author or of the department that has sponsored it.

The ostensible theme of the work, we are told, is the ancient world, but its real purpose is to demonstrate the ways

of politicians with public funds and to focus on the problems of our day the light of world experience. We might reasonably expect, if not some new facts about ancient history, at least familiar facts refreshingly presented with modern instances. We find neither new light on the ancient world nor illumination by ancient precept of our own dark days.

The standard of scholarship is set by the bibliography, in which many of the citations are of little worth, half of them belong to the last century, and one only, the English translation of the revised first volume of Andreades' great work on Greek public finance, can be included among the important and recent works in the field.

The book opens with an account of the public finance of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Palestine under the Hebrews, Persia, and Lydia. This survey leads to a Spenglerian generalization: apart from Persia and Lydia, which were solvent

when they collapsed, these States passed through a cycle of flourishing monarchy rising to a height of wealth and magnificence, and so by hybriatic extravagance to bankruptcy. The moral, that we should live within our income, was better pointed by Micawber, and the factual survey on which it is based is superficial and lacking in time-sense. The author leaps from the Great Pyramids to Hellenistic Egypt with uncritical ease.

The survey of Greek finance is more detailed. There is a brief account of writings on Greek finance and a review of Greek financial practice, with special reference to Athens. There is a separate chapter on Athens and Macedonia. This survey is for the most part a garbled summary of Andreades, with a few pages drawn from Jaeger's disappointing *Demosthenes* and some *obiter dicta* of the author's. The financial history is woven against a background of politics, the pattern of which lacks perspective and balance; too much attention, for instance, is given to Eubulus and Demosthenes compared with that given to fifth-century Athens. The author, moreover, has an inadequate grasp of both his first-hand and his second-hand sources. It is significant that for Solon and Theognis he refers to Buchholz, 1886 (p. 76, n. 4); that he shows no knowledge of recent valuable work on archaeological evidence; that the Homeric king's household, which must often have been no more than a big

farm, is 'the financial center of a kingdom' (pp. 85-6); that the rule of nobles is distinguished from that of oligarchs (p. 86); that Pericles is given the credit for introducing the practice of appointing archons and lesser officers, as well as members of the Council of Five Hundred, purely by lot (p. 111, apparently taken from Bury, *History of Greece*, ed. 1, p. 349). There is, too, the same tendency as with Egypt, to treat financial practices of different times as of the same age.

There is, inevitably, much that is pertinent and sound. The author is interesting and reasonable in his notes on *eisphora*, which he prefers to regard as a property-tax rather than a capital levy, and on Demosthenes, whose Fourth Philippic he thinks authentic, as a revised plan of Demosthenes for financing the war against Macedonia. There is, however, nothing novel in this, or in his conclusion that the 'misfortunes (of Athens) ought not to be attributed primarily, still less exclusively, to unsound finance'.

The work concludes with a brief account of the commercial oligarchies of Carthage and Rhodes, which is slight and wholly derivative.

In fine, this is a disappointing book, which does little that is claimed for it and is not a fair reflection of its author's command of modern themes.

W. J. SARTAIN.

Selwyn College, Cambridge.

ANCIENT CHARITIES

Hendrik BOLKESTEIN: *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*. Ein Beitrag zum Problem 'Moral und Gesellschaft'. Pp. xvi+492. Utrecht: Oosthoek, 1939. Paper, fl. 13.50.

THIS study covers a wide field very thoroughly, raises important points, and reaches interesting conclusions. Professor Bolkestein reviews in turn the civilizations of Egypt, Israel, Greece, and Rome in the pre-Christian period. The two main questions that he addresses to them are: 'Towards what

groups do they recognize obligations?' and 'What are the principal virtues in their practice and their preaching?'. The review is systematic and exhaustive, but, in places, could with advantage be made more concise. The reader who takes a short cut to the author's conclusions, however, will miss many important discussions.

Certain features these four civilizations possess in common. They all recognize obligations to friends, relatives, and the aged. What chiefly differentiates them is their attitude to the

poor. Oriental morality is concerned primarily with the relations between high and low, rich and poor; Greek and Roman with those of equals. All recognize justice as one of the principal virtues, but whereas justice in Greece and Rome means giving to each man his due, in Egypt and Israel it more often than not implies fair dealing to the poor. Generosity in Greece has no special connexion with poverty; in the East it implies, above all, giving to the poor. This essential difference the author fully illustrates from the sayings of the wise in Egypt, from the Old Testament, and from the literature of Greece and Rome. In their practice the same difference is noted. In the East priests often provide for the poor, and temples give asylum primarily to the destitute. The king is regarded as the shepherd of his people and the special protector of the oppressed; whereas the Greek and Roman States think rather in terms of citizens. Thus corn is distributed at Athens and Rome to citizens as a right, and not to poor men as a charity—and here, it may be noted, Professor Bolkestein reaches, independently, the same conclusions as Dr. van Berchem in his recent study of the *frumentationes*. The same attitude is further illustrated by an interesting examination of such words as *δικαιοσύνη*, *φιλάνθρωπία*, *εὖ ποιεῖν*. The reason for the difference the author finds in the social structures of the civilizations, the great gulf in wealth and power between poor and rich in the East; as contrasted with the political activity of the West. Poverty in the East is regarded almost as a virtue: in Greece it corrupts a man.

With the Hellenistic period we begin to see a fusion of the two attitudes, which becomes more marked under the Roman Empire. It is even reflected in the changing connotation of such words

as *φιλάνθρωπία* and *ἐλεος*, which narrow in reference and take on a more Oriental flavour. What forces produced this change? The author sees in the Ptolemies the direct descendants of the Pharaohs in theory and practice, uninfluenced by Greek philosophical views of the *βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης*. Hecataeus' description of Egypt (in Diodorus) is not a Greek Utopia, but a realistic description of old Egyptian practice. The influence of philosophers is minimized, and the developments of the Empire are seen as the natural result of an increasing approximation to Oriental conditions in the growth of autocracy and the depression of the lower classes. This is more controversial than the preceding survey. Professor Bolkestein dismisses the various treatises on kingship in the Hellenistic period with some contempt. It is true that the surviving fragments are not impressive, but the best of these treatises are unknown to us, and the very number of them needs explanation. The influence of Alexander himself in provoking new views on kingship needs consideration, and in a book that is so well documented it is surprising to find no reference to Tarn. It is consistent with his view that the author dismisses philosophic influences from the revolt of Aristonicus. He returns to the view that the name chosen by the rebels, *Ἡλιοπολίται*, was derived from Heliopolis in Syria and has nothing to do with the Utopia of Iambulus. This we find hard to believe, especially in view of the interest shown in the movement by Blossius of Cumae.

But, even where the author's conclusions are least easy to accept, the evidence is fully set out to invite discussion. His book is a rich storehouse and should stimulate new and useful work.

R. MEIGGS.

Balliol College, Oxford.

AN ECONOMIC SURVEY OF ANCIENT ROME

An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, edited by Tenney FRANK. Vol. IV. Pp. viii+950. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 22s. 6d.

I CANNOT enter on the task of reviewing this fourth volume of the *Economic Survey* without expressing the heavy sense of loss which every student, not merely of Roman economic history, but

of Rome itself, has experienced by the death of Professor Frank: there is hardly a period of Roman history which has not been illuminated by his writing and research, and while he was perhaps best known for his work on the economic history of Rome, he was not that uncouth being, 'a mere economic historian', but had found time for books and studies on Catullus and Cicero and Virgil. Nor, on the personal side, can I forget the generosity with which he accepted for the *American Journal of Philology* my first article, and the unvarying kindness and courtesy he always showed.

For the *Survey* his death must have created a serious problem—that of continuance. For though this volume contains four sections, of various length, upon Africa, Syria, Greece, and Asia Minor, and though the publishers promise us a fifth volume which will deal with Italy of the imperial age (which is cheering news), we must still ask 'What has happened to Thrace, Dacia, Moesia, and Pannonia? Are they to be left out in the cold?' Let us hope that room may still be found for them, either in volume V itself or in some supplementary volume; there is no lack of Rumanian or Hungarian scholars who could tackle the task successfully, and while the volume need not be a fat one, it would contain some very important information for the history of the later Empire.

The section on Africa, of 120 pages, was entrusted to Mr. R. M. Haywood. Here, amid a mass of well-arranged detail, the item which will perhaps most interest the student of ancient economic history is the collection of the inscriptions relating to the imperial domains, with translation and commentary, on pp. 88–102. In interpreting these H. adopts the view of Frank, that the situation revealed by the inscriptions can best be explained as the culmination of a long historical process rather than as the adoption of oriental practices. H. rightly stresses the lamp industry, and the wide distribution of some of its products; in this connexion I have often wondered whether the lamps of the 'officina Sempronii' may not come from

a firm which owed its beginnings to the banished Sempronius Gracchus, who kept himself alive by conveying between Africa and Sicily what Tacitus calls 'sordidas merces' (*Annals*, iv. 13).

Syria, by Dr. F. Heichelheim, occupies the next 140 pages: he can draw not only upon the Greek and Latin sources but upon Talmudic as well, and this gives the section an unusual fullness and interest. These pages are tightly packed with information, sometimes amusing, e.g. p. 128 on the export of wine, or p. 240 on the virtuous Apollonius, and always instructive: one notes the huge slave-households of prosperous Antioch (p. 165), the contribution that Syria made to Law and Literature (pp. 167–72), the Palmyrene Tariff-Table (pp. 250 ff.), and an interesting list of the times that journeys took between different cities; one wishes that H. had been able to examine these carefully and compare with other data, such as can be found, e.g., in Evagrius, for it is not clear whether these times are exceptional ones or average. If some scholars should find too much cataloguing here let them turn to the four introductory pages, 123–6, where H. shows he can interpret the data he has collected; these four pages are full of interesting verdicts, and contain a useful reminder for those whose eyes are too firmly fixed on western Europe that in the first five hundred years of the Islamic world 'the Greek and Roman heritage, if lost in the West, was restored by the East'.

To Professor Larsen was allotted the section on Greece, which runs to some 230 pages. Here I cannot help feeling that the first forty pages are unnecessary, or could have been drastically compressed, for the economic history proper only begins about p. 303. There is an excellent account of the economic life of Delos, and the part devoted to the principate is full and detailed, but I must be allowed to register two grumbles. One is that L. minimizes the evidence for the *δουλευθρωπία* of Greece under the Empire; however much one takes off for rhetorical commonplaces, to my mind all the evidence points strongly to the same conclusion, lack of

physical and spiritual creativeness, and we may observe the same poverty in the early centuries of the Byzantine Empire.¹ The second point is that the section on the third century seems disappointingly small.

Perhaps the best and most satisfying section is that on Asia Minor by Professor T. R. S. Broughton. Four hundred pages make almost a book in itself, but the area covered is large and does form a rough general unity. One notes that the precious metals in Asia Minor were worked out by the end of the third century, and wonders whence it was that the Byzantines drew the gold for their superb and long-lasting coinage; Armenia or Caucasia? or did it come in the course of trade? The section devoted to the land is extremely good, starting as it does from the one institution that has remained unchanging in the basic social structure—the Anatolian village. Further on, in pp. 656 ff., will be found a translation and commentary on the famous inscriptions of Aga Bey Köy and of the Tembris valley, while p. 738 produces an interesting note on the languages of the peninsula, show-

ing the persistence of such tongues as Galatic, Cappadocian, and Lycaonian, and the renaissance of the old Phrygian tongue in Neo-Phrygian. Everywhere we get informative documents: the strike of the bakers on p. 847, the trouble with the banks and the 'black exchange' on p. 892, the evidence afforded by the increase in the police forces for the growing brigandage and discontent in Asia Minor during the third century, while Goths and pirates were ravaging the coastal towns, which began hastily to rebuild their walls. B. might add to his references here the three poems (in *Suppl. Epig. Graecum*, iv, 1929, 467) in honour of Festus the pro-consul of Asia, who did good work in rebuilding and adorning the precinct of Apollo at Miletus.

Although it is possible to find here and there a minor inaccuracy, or a view from which one may dissent, it would be the sheerest curmudgeonry not to welcome heartily a magnificent piece of work; it is an indispensable source-book, immense industry and research must have gone to the making of it, and students of the Empire owe to the contributors a deep debt of gratitude.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

ROMAN BRITAIN

The Romans in Britain. A selection of Latin texts. Edited with a commentary by R. W. MOORE. Pp. xii + 214; 1 map; 7 illustrations. London: Methuen, 1938. Cloth, 6s.

HE who undertook to review this book for the *C.R.* has played false; to appeal to another expert on Roman Britain would mean further delay of an overdue notice; I have stepped into the breach of faith.

Mr. Moore has put together the chief Latin literary texts that tell about our island, with some that merely mention it by the way, and with inscriptions *quant. suff.*; and the gaps between one Latin text and another are covered by English narrative or by translations from Greek. The book 'is offered to all whose interest in Roman Britain may

prompt them to read the ancient authorities. Its form should commend it also for use in schools.' My main doubts are whether the arm-chair reader will not need more help over some hard Latin than he is given, and whether the schoolboy is not given either too little or too much. Mr. Moore takes pains with the syntax of Caesar and Tacitus: but many phrases that raise no question of syntax are left obscure; and a casual reference to 'the Toledo MS.' (of *Agri-cola*: p. 162), or to a nicety of palaeography such as the confusion of *v̄ra* (which should be *ur̄a*) and *n̄ra*, may bewilder rather than stimulate or instruct. However, an able teacher could make the book go; and it is good to show the schoolboy that the Roman story of Britain does not end with

¹ K. Krumbacher, *Die griech. Literatur des Mittelalters*, p. 330.

Caesar, or even with Tacitus. But let him not labour too heavily over Gildas and Bede.

In the Latin texts I have found a few misprints: 'Galgacus' (who in the index, by the way, appears neither under C nor under G); 'quae omnis mala' (omnia) on p. 77; 'illic', 'propositio' (illi, proposito) on p. 90. In the commentary,

'The Brigantes are mentioned elsewhere as having shared in the Boudicca revolt' (p. 163) needs 'not' after 'are'. Minor slips are 'Strasburg' and 'Paulis'.

Mr. Moore has attempted what was well worth doing, and worth doing well; and he has done it well enough.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

A SCHOOLBOOK ON ROMAN PUBLIC LIFE

G. LAGUERRE: *La Vie des Romains — La Vie publique*. I, II. Pp. xvi+148, 216; many illustrations. Paris: Librairie Classique Eugène Belin, 1938. Cloth, fr. 22 and 28.50.

THE conditions under which Latin has to be taught and learnt to-day bring with them certain difficulties unknown before: as compensation, they produce the most ingenious and interesting attempts at solution. The two volumes here in question are only a part of a very elaborate system for the complete teaching of Latin—grammar, language, antiquities—many of them by the same author, Madame Laguerre, Professeur de Latin au Lycée des jeunes filles de Nîmes. Vol. i deals with 'Le Camp', vol. ii with 'Le Forum', but the two are not on quite the same level of difficulty, as vol. i is for classes 4, 3, and 2, vol. ii for classes 3, 2, and 1. In both volumes the general treatment of material is much the same. There are selected passages from Roman prose and verse authors linked more or less directly to different phases of life in camp and forum. There are passages to be rendered into Latin, and short subjects for essays, vocabularies, notes on idioms, etc. Illustrations are plentiful, varied, and, on the whole, very well chosen. Here and there some more general theme is introduced and discussed for a few pages—e.g. the development of the Roman language, Roman literature, Roman art.

So much of Roman literature refers to wars in one form or another that vol. i, 'Le Camp', can be illustrated for the most part very fully and directly. It was an ingenious idea to tack on a description of Ostia to the section on

the Roman Navy. In vol. ii, 'Le Forum', there is more scope for artifice: thus, for example, an account of the death of Cicero is associated with the *rostra*, the death of Vitellius with the *scalae Gemoniae*, the killing of Virginia by her father with the *tabernae novae*. The illustrations are drawn from many sources—inscriptions, coins, bas-reliefs, sculptures, modern views of places, modern models. The general standard of accuracy seems to be high.

This is certainly a very remarkable instrument of teaching that is here offered. There can be no question of the enthusiasm and wide knowledge of the author, any more than there can be of her practical experience of teaching. Perhaps the best thing of all is that these volumes stimulate the reader to experiment further on similar lines himself.

A few criticisms at once suggest themselves. Surely references should be given to all Latin passages quoted. They are given, it is true, in a leaflet 'à l'usage exclusif des professeurs': but is this reserve necessary? The illustrations vary in quality, though on the whole they are successful. The choice and arrangement of material is individual and only partly methodical. The 'petites études sur l'histoire de la langue et de la littérature latines', etc., are almost terrifying in their brief simplicity. If the modern pupil cannot stand the old grind, will he or she really assimilate the masses of information here provided, however attractively dressed up? These are problems, honestly raised, which should be tested in class, and any teacher of Latin who is interested in novel methods may be

encouraged to make the test. It is perhaps best to conclude on a quotation from the preface to vol. i: 'le but de ce livre, *La Vie des Romains*, est de permettre à l'enfant de lire un grand nombre de textes latins, et, mieux, de

lui donner envie de les lire.' Those last few words give the real attack of the book, and encourage the reviewer to send it on its way with a cheer.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

SOME CLASS-BOOKS

Homer: *Iliad* XI. Edited by E. S. FORSTER. Pp. ix+99; plates and map. (Methuen's Classical Texts.) London: Methuen, 1939. Cloth, 3s. 6d. (with vocabulary).

H. S. JUDGE and T. H. PORTER: *Latin Prose Composition for Upper Forms*. Pp. 128. London: Murray, 1940. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Peter ROBERTSON: *Latin Prose Composition for Schools and Colleges*. Pp. xii+331. London: Macmillan, 1939. Cloth.

Harry L. LEVY: *A Latin Reader for Colleges*. Pp. xi+264. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939. Cloth, \$2.25.

It is to be feared that the plunge into Homer from simple Attic Greek will always be difficult. Professor Forster's edition of *Iliad* xi will prove very useful to teachers who wish to put into the hands of their pupils an edition which, while giving scholarly help, does not smooth away all the difficulties. The notes in this book are terse and to the point, and they deal with the matters upon which a beginner wants guidance. It may be doubted whether one beginning Homer should be given the eleventh book first, and perhaps it is the editor's intention to bring out editions of other single books besides this; if so, he could not do better than to repeat bodily his excellent introductory matter. Most introductions to school editions are never read: this at least deserves to be.

The two books on Latin prose composition, in spite of the similarity of their titles, are widely different in their scope. Messrs. Judge and Porter have assembled a hundred English passages suitable for translation into Latin in the Sixth Form, some of which have actually been set in Higher Certificate examinations. The standard of difficulty appears to be carefully maintained in most cases, and the majority of the

extracts are historical. There is a light-hearted introduction entitled 'Setting about it' from which the learner will derive perhaps more entertainment than instruction, as well as six introductory passages where hints are given. These hints are sound, but it is hard to believe that some of them would be needed by a pupil capable of tackling proses like these at all. Mr. Robertson's book is a complete course in composition intended to carry the learner from the end of the first year to the Higher Certificate standard, and so designed as to be capable of being used with equal convenience by those who will not go beyond the School (or Lower Leaving) Certificate and by those who will. Mr. Robertson states and illustrates rules clearly and does not waste words, and of several such books which have appeared lately this seems to be in general the most satisfactory. The exercises are straightforward and lead up to pieces of continuous prose of an easy character.

In many ways the most interesting of this batch of school-books is Mr. Levy's reader. It is a large and handsomely produced book of passages from Aulus Gellius, Nepos, Caesar, and Phaedrus, together with introduction, very copious notes, an outline of grammar and syntax, and a vocabulary. It would not be easy to fit this book into the usual demands of the curriculum in this country, since the Latin text is of a very simple character, whereas the commentary implies a distinctly more advanced interest in Roman history and antiquities. As for the 'grammatical outline', it even explains that 'possession may be expressed by the genitive case' and that 'a verb agrees with its subject in person and number'. It will be seen that this book

appears to be designed for pupils whose knowledge of Latin is far behind what we should expect in this country in those who are capable of appreciating an excellent note on the opinions of Protagoras or an account of the career of Marius. It appears admirably to succeed in its intention, and the notes seem to be most comprehensive and

scholarly. It may be permitted to deplore the absence of illustrations, which would further enhance the excellence of an unusually attractive school-book. American boys and girls are fortunate if all the books which they are given to study are as well produced as this.

D. S. COLMAN.

Shrewsbury School.

SHORT REVIEWS

Samuel Eliot MORISON: *The Ancient Classics in a Modern Democracy*. Commencement Address delivered at the College of Wooster, 12 June 1939. Pp. 26. London: Oxford University Press, 1939. Paper, 3s.

AN eloquent defence of classical education, noteworthy both for the vigour and pungency of its style and for the fact that its author is not a professional teacher of ancient languages but a distinguished writer on modern American history who finds that 'the classics have given him more delight, and certainly afforded him more wisdom, than anything else that he has since learned'. In the Middle West, even more obviously than elsewhere, classical culture is fighting against heavy odds, and like a good general Professor Morison wisely withdraws from advanced positions which have become untenable: 'I admit that for the average American student whose education is to terminate at the age of sixteen or thereabouts, the little Latin he might acquire before that age had perhaps better be sacrificed for something more immediately useful.' But he pleads forcibly that the strong meat of Latin, Greek, and mathematics should not be denied to the few who can assimilate it because the majority can digest only pap. 'We need the classics because our country needs the intelligent leadership and disinterested service of an intellectual aristocracy—not a plutocracy, or a hereditary ruling caste, but an intellectual *élite* recruited from the people, as Thomas Jefferson said, "without regard to wealth, birth or accidental condition or circumstance".' Otherwise, 'our civilization threatens to become the mirror where the common man contemplates himself, and is pleased at the sight of his imperfections'. The warning applies to more places than Ohio.

E. R. DODDS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Eradito: Raccolta dei frammenti e traduzione italiana di R. WALZER. Pp. viii+156. Florence: Sansoni, 1939. Paper, L.30.

MR. WALZER has produced a valuable book, whose merits may best be estimated by a comparison with Kranz's new edition of Diels's *Vorsokratiker*. To this the debt of any editor of an individual Pre-Socratic must be great, and in textual matters Mr. Walzer is almost entirely guided by it, occasionally even printing without note what is in fact an emendation of Diels, e.g. ἐγκυρεῖσιν in fr. 17.

Where he goes far beyond anything that considerations of space make possible in the larger work is in richness of testimonies and illustrative material.

Mr. Walzer rightly refuses to make any attempt to classify the fragments, but he gives countless cross-references, and prints in full not only the source (or sources) of a fragment, but also other passages in which allusion is made to it. For the more obscure of these especially this is a great convenience. There is also appended to each fragment a list of references to modern learned literature. In both matters there are a few unaccountable omissions (e.g. no mention is made of Plato, *Soph.* 242 D in connexion with fr. 10, or of Gomperz's and Wilamowitz's interpretation of fr. 11, though both are in Diels), but they are much less remarkable than the minute acquaintance with the literature of Heraclitus shown on every page.

Mr. Walzer is sparing of explanation, though when he offers it it is always to the point, and the non-textual notes are mainly illustrative. It is interesting to see, both from the preface and from the frequency with which it is cited, that the revolutionary and stimulating work of O. Gigon (*Untersuchungen zu Heraklit*, 1935) is beginning to make its influence felt.

Translations, which seem sound, are provided not only of the actual fragments but also of the doxographical passages of Diels's Part A. For a work of this complexity the printing is extremely good and accurate. But it is not an easy book to use. The eye is easily confused among the mass of notes of various kinds appended to each fragment, numbers are used for two different purposes, and it is often necessary to give one's attention to several pages at once.

W. HAMILTON.

Eton College, Windsor.

Francis ADAMS, *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, translated from the Greek. Introduction by E. C. Kelly, M.D. Pp. viii+384; 8 plates. London: Baillière, Tindall, & Cox, 1939. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

It is difficult to see what precisely is the purpose of this American reprint of Francis Adams's translation of Hippocrates. As the Preface (3½ pages long, of which 1½ are taken from Adams) tells us, the translation, originally published in 1849, was 'again published in 1886 and 1929', so that it should

be already available to any who need it. But for whom is this present reprint intended? It is handsomely enough produced; but 'most of the footnotes have been deleted' (so has the rest of Adams's annotation), 'and a continuous and connected picture of medicine in the Golden Age of Greece is the result'. It is not stated whether Adams's footnotes are considered to be a hindrance to the understanding of the translation or a disfigurement of the picture of Greek medicine which the text offers. Those who are best qualified to judge, while recognizing the value of Adams's scholarship, tend to place his medical and surgical annotations on a higher level. Perhaps, then, we should regard the present volume as a 'popular' reprint, intended as a protreptic for those who are fascinated by the name and prestige of Hippocrates, to induce them to pursue their study of him more deeply and more intelligently. One might, however, wish that some indication had been given of how this is to be done. No reference is made to any later, or indeed to any other, work on Hippocrates, nor to the recent English translation by W. H. S. Jones and E. T. Withington. The eight pages of plates included in Adams's original edition are reproduced in a somewhat less distinct form, together with his 'Explanations'.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

Demosthenes, *Private Orations*, Vol. III. With an English translation by A. T. MURRAY. Pp. viii + 451. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1939. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.)

THIS volume, the third of four, contains some of the liveliest speeches of the Demosthenic corpus, especially the *Polycles*, the *Conon*, and the *Neaera*. Its merits and faults are those of its precursors, reviewed in *C.R.* 1937, p. 176, and 1939, p. 146. A high general level is marred by occasional errors, indicative chiefly of a lack of mental alertness. It is careless, for instance, on p. 16 to say that 'Hieron was on the eastern shore of the Cimmerian Bosphorus (the strait between the Black Sea and the Sea of Azof)'. In vol. I, p. 283, Murray correctly placed it in the Thracian Bosphorus, and the blunder here exaggerates grotesquely the genuine severity of Apollodorus' convoy duties. The translation is occasionally a little loose. For example, ἡδιστ' ἄν . . . θανάτου κρίνας τοῦτον in *Conon* c. 1 means 'I should have been very glad to get the defendant condemned to death', not (as Murray writes) 'to prosecute the defendant on a capital charge', and the rendering of πᾶν ἄλλων τῶν οὐ καθαρυνόντων in *Neaera* c. 78 by 'all else that pollutes' repeats one of the many errors which marked Jane Harrison's handling of that important passage. A few more notes would also be welcome, for instance in connexion with the trierarchy. The printing is excellent, but on p. 349 '373 B.C.' is an unfortunate misprint for '343 B.C.'

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

K. I. ΒΟΥΡΒΕΡΗΣ: *Ἡ ἐθνικὴ συνείδησις τοῦ Πλάτωνος*. Pp. 51. Athens, 1939. Paper.

IN an earlier work Vourveris printed sixty excerpts

from Plato to illustrate the Platonic attitude towards the non-Hellenic peoples. On this basis, supplemented by some additional references, he now expounds Plato's racial views. Much is made of *Rep.* 470 c d: Greeks and barbarians are 'enemies by nature', and, though Plato does not propose a Greek 'Staatsnation', the Greeks are, or ought to be, a 'Kulturnation', bound as they are by kinship and religion and distinguished from all other nations by their 'love of learning' (*Rep.* 435 e). The Greeks admittedly stood in need of a reformation which it was Plato's patriotic aim to supply. But with all their faults, though the Persians surpass them in truthfulness and the Egyptians were the first to think of geometry, the 'reason and wisdom' of the Greeks outweigh all the achievements of barbarity. Plato was thoroughly devoted to the Hellenic tradition; and his traditionalism helps to explain his hostility to innovations in poetry and art. In sum, Plato taught no cosmopolitanism, no doctrine of the universal brotherhood of man; nor can he rightly be regarded as the father of such doctrines.

It is a one-sided picture. V.'s excerpts do not include, e.g. *Laws* 776 d, or *Rep.* 501 b, where it appears that Plato's ideal for his citizens is τὸ ἀνδρεῖκελον (which is also τὸ θεοεῖκελον) and not by any means τὸ ἑλληνεῖκελον. And the excerpting method is notoriously dangerous: why, for example, should Plato be credited with the views of 'Pausanias' (*Symp.* 182 b c)? In general, under the influence of a regrettable modern tendency to reduce philosophy to history, this work overstates the local and temporal element in Plato.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

K. I. ΒΟΥΡΒΕΡΗΣ: *Κράτος καὶ παιδεία κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα*. Pp. 31. Athens, 1939. Paper.

AN enthusiastic admirer of Plato here explains with numerous citations the Platonic theses: that right education is the only cure for political chaos, and should therefore be the primary function of the state; this task can, however, be carried out only by a statecraft which is identical with genuine philosophy, for its end is goodness in general, and not mere polymathy or technical proficiency. Among the 'sanctions' of government (friendship, praise, respect for law, etc.) one misses any reference to *Laws* x and religion. The author has not intended to write critically, and does not discuss controversial points such as Plato's treatment of the family, or his undue depreciation (based on the artificial gap between δόξα and ἐπιστήμη) of technical education.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

Stanley WILCOX: *The Destructive Hypothetical Syllogism in Greek Logic and in Attic Oratory*. Pp. 143. (Yale Dissertation, photo-copy of typescript) 1938. Paper.

If he were honest he would be poor; but in fact he is not poor. Here is one of eighty-two examples of this form of argument which the author has found in the Attic orators. The oratorical form differs in some respects from that which was recognized by

logicians later than Aristotle: the logicians used different particles; in oratory, but not in logic, the antecedent is always a 'contrary to fact' condition, the minor premiss frequently precedes the major, and as a rule the conclusion is not explicitly stated. Sometimes, too, the oratorical use of this syllogism is 'less an argument than . . . a plan for the construction of a paragraph'. This is true, e.g., of Euripides, *Heracles*, 655-72, an early and interesting example of rhetorical style, where the conclusion is both absent and unwanted. This passage is unfortunately classed as illustrating the generalization that most major premisses concern human choice (*εἰ δὲ θεοὶ ἦν εὐνοεῖς*, &c.), and hence may be brought under the 'topic from mistakes' of Theodorus of Byzantium, who, it is suggested, may have introduced this syllogism into Athens. In spite of the differences between oratorical and logical practice the author concludes that the logicians who recognized this form of argument were indebted to the orators rather than to the mere spontaneous reasoning of untrained thinkers. But the interest of the work lies chiefly in the detailed discussion of passages which give an opportunity to trace the growth of uniformity (as in the use of particles), clarity and vigour in rhetorical prose; and to appraise the style of the various orators. As one might expect, Antiphon is found to use this type of argument with a certain awkwardness and possibly 'without conscious intention' (e.g. v. 26, 27); while Lysias is the first to introduce what proved to be the normal method of presenting it. This dissertation contains much good matter, and the results of this, or of a more extended, inquiry might well be written up in a more pleasing style and published in a more attractive form.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

Martin DIBELIUS: *Paulus auf dem Areopag.* Pp. 56. (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1938/39. 2.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1939. Paper, RM. 2.80.

DISCUSSION of the Areopagus Lecture in Acts xvii has, in recent years, commonly taken one or other of two lines. Either one accumulates parallels from the Pauline letters to show how Pauline the speech is, or one sets out to prove it an intrusion in Acts by exposing inconsistencies and contradictions between it and the rest of the book. Professor Dibelius in this monograph tries a different line. He seeks to discover the character and sense of the speech as a whole, and then to inquire whether Paul could have uttered it, and what purpose it is meant to serve in the Book of Acts. This involves, in the first place, a very careful—and very instructive—study of the text to bring out the main contentions of the speech and their exact force. The final result of this part of the inquiry may be given in Dibelius's own words: 'Was wir vor uns haben, ist eine hellenistische Rede von der wahren Gotteserkenntnis' (p. 36).

The historical problem now is: Could Paul have delivered such a lecture? This can only be answered by seeing what Paul, in his letters, says about 'the knowledge of God' and 'man's kinship with God'—the two main themes of the speech.

The result of the comparison is that the speech is not Pauline. The speaker at Athens is not the Paul who wrote the Epistles: he is rather the forerunner of the Apologists (p. 42).

There remains the literary problem: Is the speech an intrusion in Acts or an integral part of the work? Dibelius's answer is that the speech was not inserted by a reviser of Acts but is the work of the author himself, who composed what seemed to him a suitable address for such an occasion (p. 50). It is a tribute to his skill that the later Church found Paul speaking to the Athenians much easier to follow than Paul writing to the Romans. 'Die Areopagrede ward zum Wahrzeichen christlicher Theologie auf dem Boden griechischer Geistesbildung' (p. 56).

About some of the details of the exposition it is legitimate to have doubts—the interpretation of the *καυοί* and the *ὁποθεῖται τῆς κατοικίας* is not convincing to the present writer—but Professor Dibelius treats a large question in a large way, and his method and arguments have done much to clarify the real issues in the discussion.

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

H. L. DAVIDS: *De Gnomologieën van Sint Gregorius van Nazianze.* Pp. 164. Nijmegen: Dekker en Van de Vegt, 1940. Paper.

OF St. Gregory's 'poemata moralia' Davids has chosen to edit the so-called gnomological pieces, Nos. 31, 32, 33, 30, in that order (Migne, xxxvii. 908 ff.), adding a close translation into Dutch and a lengthy commentary. St. Gregory's work is full of reminiscences of Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Hesiod, Euripides, and many others, and Davids has found it a fascinating, and sometimes difficult, task to lay bare the 'seeds' of his thought and expression. Davids finds his author especially well acquainted with the philosophy of the Cynics, and the poetry (in particular the *Μονόστιχοι*) of Menander, although the debt to Menander has been exaggerated by Christ-Schmid-Stählin. Gregory's Biblical sources are also noted in detail. This editorial work has been well and competently done. Language and metre are treated separately in additional chapters; here perhaps the treatment, though sound, is rather general, and many minor puzzles go unremarked. One interesting conclusion, backed by serious arguments, is that No. 32 (the *Γνωμικά διότιχα*) cannot be the work of Gregory but belongs to a later poet.

The work is a 'dissertation', and there is some danger that its real merit may be obscured by the usual tiresome qualities of the *ἀγώνισμα*. Among these one may note the needless accumulation of learning: for example, when Gregory asks us to remember death, what need is there for several parallels quoted *in extenso*? One may note also a misplaced ingenuity: when Gregory says *γυνὸς ὅλος βιότιοι τὰμοῖς ἅλα*, everyone hitherto has been content to construe *βιότιοι* with *ἅλα*, but Davids insists with much learning that *βιότιοι* means 'wealth' and depends on *γυνὸς*, thus robbing Gregory's metaphor of its precise application.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

H. C. YOUTIE and O. M. PEARL: *Tax Rolls from Karanis*. Part II: Text and Indexes. (Michigan Papyri, Vol. IV, Part II.) Pp. xv + 266; 3 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, \$4.

WHEN Part I of this publication appeared (*C.R.* li. 240) the intention was to complete it in two parts, the second containing some additional fragments, an introduction, notes, and the indexes. The material has, however, grown so much that the editors decided to relegate the introduction and commentary (with the text of four further fragments discovered recently) to a third part. The present one contains a number of fragments, supplying some of the columns missing in Nos. 224 and 225, besides portions of new rolls, a revised table of papyri, Addenda and Corrigenda to Part I, the indexes, which are very full, and a most useful series of 'lists of taxpayers and their payments', arranged according to the taxes paid. These lists and the indexes will enormously facilitate the use of Part I, though for most scholars the introduction and commentary will be necessary for the complete utilization of this magnificent series of tax rolls, which provides a unique mass of evidence on the financial and to some extent the social condition of an important Fayûm village during the second century of our era. Meantime we can only congratulate the University of Michigan on its acquisition of these rolls and on the skill and meticulous care with which they have been edited. A considerable portion of the rolls is in the Cairo Museum, the authorities of which deserve the highest praise for the public spirit which has led them to place their fragments so unreservedly at the disposal of the Michigan editors.

H. I. BELL.
British Museum.

Frank Pierce JONES: *The ab urbe condita Construction in Greek*. A Study in the Classification of the Participle. Pp. 96. (*Language*, Vol. 15, No. 1, Supplement.) Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1939. Paper, \$1.35.

GOODWIN (*GMT* 829 b, c) placed examples of this usage among the 'attributive' uses of the participle; they are classed as 'circumstantial' by Kühner-Gerth; while Stahl placed them in the group which is usually called 'supplementary'. Where obscure or ambiguous cases are concerned, the confusion among commentators and grammarians is even more striking. The cause of the trouble lies in the illogicality of the usual threefold system for classifying the participle; 'attributive', when it does not refer merely to position, describes the relation of the participle to its noun, whereas 'circumstantial' and 'supplementary' refer to the relation between the participle and the main verb. The remedy is to re-classify all participles (in the predicative position) according to the relation they bear to their nouns. Jones divides them into non-restrictive and complementary. The non-restrictive participle adds information which is not necessary for identifying its noun. The complementary participle combines with its noun to form a functional unit in the sentence. To the complementary group belong all true examples of the *a.u.c.* construction as well as all genitives and accusatives

absolute and most of the examples ordinarily treated as 'supplementary'. Jones proceeds to list examples of the *a.u.c.* construction according to their grammatical function in the sentence. In his very judicious discussions of difficult cases he exposes quite a number of ill-founded dicta of the commentators, e.g. that the participle concerned is generally the aorist—there are in fact twice as many presents concerned as aorists both in Thucydides (who is especially fond of this usage) and elsewhere; or that the participle may stand in the attributive as well as in the predicative position—among some two hundred examples Jones finds only three which support this assertion, and three certainly do not suffice to establish a new use for the attributive position. In sum, this is a dissertation of unusual merit.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

W. A. OLDFATHER, H. V. CANTER and K. M. ABBOTT: *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum*. Pp. 583. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1938. Cloth.

THIS index, begun by Professors M. N. Wetmore and A. M. Dame, has been carried through by three scholars whose experience in a peculiarly exacting kind of altruistic labour assures its reliability. Purser's Oxford text of 1901-3 has been taken as a basis, and all words occurring in his text or in his apparatus have been recorded; the editors have also included all conjectures made or revived between 1900 and 1937 and have greatly increased the value of their work by prefixing an *Additamentum ad Apparatum Criticum* of ninety pages in which the contributions to the textual criticism of Cicero (apart from new manuscript readings) made during that period are listed in the order of the text with references to the books or journals in which they were published. No distinction is made between Cicero's own writing and that of his correspondents, but the user of an index cannot complain if he has to do some work for himself. The arrangement and the typography are admirable, and random tests have revealed very few misprints. Their very faithfulness has involved the editors in some curious consequences. At *Att.* vi. i. 13 Purser's apparatus records Bosius' conjecture as *quum* because Bosius wrote it so; the result is that here one lonely *quum* appears in an ocean of *cums* and *quoms*. And as the index does not include proper names or Greek words, *voces nihili* like *frangones*, *cepiliae*, *onaohma* are here while the certain corrections *Fangones*, *Piliae*, *ἀνάθημα* are not. The preface makes the welcome announcement that the editors are preparing indexes to the proper names and the Greek vocabulary of the whole Ciceronian corpus and hope to publish them before long in one volume with an index to the rhetorical works and an index to Cicero's poetry.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

M. L. W. LAISTNER: *Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio*. Pp. xlv + 176. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939. Cloth, \$3.50.

BEDE's two Commentaries on Acts have hitherto been known only in unsatisfactory editions. Pro-

fessor Laistner has therefore earned the gratitude of scholars by producing a thoroughly sound text of the two treatises from a great number of manuscripts. The first Commentary, the *Expositio*, was probably written between 709 and 716, for it was dedicated to Acca, Bishop of Hexham 708-16. As the *Retractatio* contains many references to the *Expositio*, it is clearly later in date, and, arguing that the pope Gregory mentioned in a gloss of Acts xix. 12 was Gregory II, who died in 731, Professor Laistner assigns the treatise to the period 716-31. The absence of any internal evidence makes close dating impossible.

For long it has been known that Bede was interested in the textual history of Acts, if not of the whole Bible. Professor Laistner has already argued that he used the Codex Amiatinus and the Latin version contained in Laudianus Graecus 35. A. C. Clark, however, dissented from this view, holding that Bede had before him a *codex gemellus* and not E itself. But Clark knew Bede only in the incorrect text of Giles. One of the results of the new edition is that the verbal identity of many of Bede's quotations with the text of E is now made plain, and the probability of Professor Laistner's suggestion enforced. Bede also made use of other translations, including perhaps one by himself. This care for textual accuracy is significant both of the man and of his age.

Professor Laistner also prints the *Nomina Regionum et Locorum de Actibus Apostolorum*, a geographical glossary often ascribed to Jerome, but now certainly assignable to Bede. The sources of these treatises are of great interest. Aratus is quoted nine times, but Bede's chief sources are Rufinus, Augustine, Jerome, and Isidore. For his geographical knowledge he relied on Pliny and Jerome. Martial, Sallust, and Suetonius are also quoted.

J. G. SIKES.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

CORA E. LUTZ: *Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum*. Pp. xxx+244. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939. Cloth, \$3.50.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA's Commentary on Martianus Capella has long been known in a single MS., Paris, B.N. lat. 12960, but it has never found an editor, although parts were published by Hauréau and by Manitius. The authenticity of the treatise is affirmed by a reference to one of its glosses contained in Remigius' Commentary (Paris, B.N. lat. 8674, f. 27^v).

The glosses are of uneven length, and a good number are solely lexicographical. Erigena's textual comments should be of interest, if not of value, to the student of Martianus. The author's especial interest in dialectic is shown by the greater attention he pays to that portion of the *De nuptiis*. Evidence of his own philosophical views is given in his account of the powers of human reason (e.g. pp. 17, 5, 12; 8, 17; 40, 11) and in his statement (p. 12, 9), further elaborated in the *De divisione naturae* (Migne, 122, 954-5) that Venus and Mercury revolve round the sun. The new treatise provides us with further evidence on the subject of Erigena's knowledge of Greek. The

false endings he gives to Greek words, as well as forced etymologies (e.g. *pyrate* from *πύρ*, p. 125, 9-11), indicate the limitations of his knowledge. Reference in this connexion might well have been made to G. Théry, *Études dionysiennes*, ii, App. III.

The single manuscript is in poor condition, and the work of editing has therefore been difficult. Throughout Miss Lutz has done her work well, and the edition is sound. The emendations she has been forced to make seem justified. In one or two places there are slight inconsistencies. If *retor* is amended to *rhetor* (p. 111, 30), it is difficult to see why *nocio* is not written *notio*, especially when the second spelling occurs in the next line (p. 98, 30-1). But this is a small matter in so good a text.

J. G. SIKES.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

C. H. TURNER: *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, I. ii. 2, Supplementum Nicaeno-Gallicum; I. ii. 4, Supplementum Nicaeno-Alexandrinum; II. 3, Concilia Laodiceum et Constantinopolitanum. Pp. vi+pp. 369-440e, 625-71 (of Vol. I), pp. 321-472 (of Vol. II). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Paper, 42s.

WHEN Professor Turner issued the first portion of *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* in 1899 he recognized the immensity of his task in the first words of his preface, *magnae molis inceptum adgredior*. When he died in 1930 the end of this task was in sight, and the three parts that are now published were already set up in type. Dr. E. Schwartz (with the help of Dr. H. G. Opitz) has prepared them for publication, and the addition of final details and corrections could have been entrusted to no fitter hands than those of the editor of *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. No attempt has been made, however, to fill up gaps where Turner had been unable to complete his work; e.g., he had hardly begun his commentary on the names of the bishops at the Council of Arles. Nor will two further parts originally projected by Turner be published. He left only a brief mention of proposed contents for I. ii. 5, and had himself relinquished the issue of II. 4 (dealing with the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon) in view of Schwartz's edition of the *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*.

In addition to the titles given above a brief mention may be made of some of the contents of the parts now issued. The Councils with which these parts deal are those of Arles i, Valence, Arles ii (*quod vocatur*), Laodicea, and Constantinople. I. ii. 4 consists of the parts of the *Sylloge* of Theodosius the Deacon (from Codex Veronensis LX) that deal with the councils of Nicaea and Sardica and with the life of Athanasius.

In his last preface (1930) Turner feared that advancing years might have lessened the care and patience that exacting work on manuscripts demanded. But the parts now issued show the same careful editing that characterized his earlier work, and the whole of the *Monumenta* is a striking memorial to the *indefessa per plus triginta annos solertia* to which Schwartz pays tribute in his preface.

J. STEVENSON.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

Index Breviarii Romani. Pp. 54. Agent for the Sale: Michael Houghton, 14 Bury Place, London, W.C. 1. 1939. Paper covers, 5s. post free.

THE work, I imagine, of a Roman Catholic priest: much to be commended. His aims are excellently described in his preface: 'Ad illa' [the various contents of the Breviary] 'intelligenda utilimum erit onomasticum quod recursus nominum rerum, personarum vel locorum indicet, cujusque ope etiam nomina aevi antiquioris sine mora in terminis geographicis solitos verti possint. . . . In ipso [opusculo] recensentur omnia nomina hominum locorumque propria quae in Breviario reperiuntur, item alia quaedam verba studio digna.' The geographical part of the index is assisted by a map, and from it we may learn that the Latin for Vienna is both Vienna [sc. Austriaca] and Vindobona, and for Champagne both Xamphana and Campania: many questions indeed are raised of nomenclature in medieval and low Latin which it would be interesting to pursue further.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

The Excavations at Dura-Europos, conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters. Preliminary Report of the Seventh and Eighth Seasons of Work, 1933-4 and 1934-5; edited by M. I. ROSTOV-TZEFF, F. E. BROWN, and C. B. WELLES. Pp. xxiv + 461; 58 plates, 86 figures, 1 map. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 44s.

THIS welcome instalment of work at Dura-Europos is still to be followed by two more *Preliminary Reports*, and a series of seven *Final Reports*: but the field work came to an end in 1936-7, the latest results are incorporated where they concern the buildings here described, and the block-plan and map of the whole city, now published, are definitive. Principal monuments in this instalment are (1) the fortifications, Hellenistic, Parthian, and Roman, with a remarkable final phase of mere embankment reinforcing the older walls; (2) the Mithraeum, twice rebuilt with modifications, and redecorated with reliefs and frescoes; it is to be reconstructed in the Yale Museum; (3) the Temple of Adonis, also painted and furnished with a curious relief representing the Dromedary-God; (4) the Temple of Zeus Theos, with the finest painted figures and victory-scene, of the second century A.D., resembling the contemporary coffin portraits of the Fayum; (5) the Temple of the Gaddé (City God) of Dura in four periods of architecture, with relief sculpture and paintings from Periods III and IV; (6) the Temple of Zeus Kyrios, also twice rebuilt; (7) the Necropolis Temple, outside the city; (8) three painted oval shields of wood, with the Trojan Horse, the Sack of Troy, Greeks and Amazons in combat, and a Warrior God of local type. These last, like the principal wall-paintings, are published in colour, after minute study by Mr. H. J. Gute. They seem to have been cast aside unused and apparently unfinished. The treatment of the scenes recalls the *Tabulae Iliacae* and the *Codex Romanus* of Virgil. A similar shield was described in Report VI. Many points of interest

arise from the coins and other small finds. One contract on parchment is published, and a deed on papyrus providing minutely for the subdivision of a dwelling-house between two occupants; and there are useful indices of proper names, and an explanation of the odd-looking Greek renderings of Aramaic names. The volume, printed in Prague, is admirably produced and illustrated, and renders a vivid impression of a fine piece of excavation.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

Etruscan Perugia, by Chandler SHAW, Ph.D. Pp. xiii + 102; 16 plates. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 28.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THE series of monographs about the single city-states of Etruria (see the excellent works of M. Pallottino on Tarquinia and of Luisa Banti on Luni) has been increased by the present work. The attempt of the author to present a picture of Etruscan civilization as it existed in the city-state of Perugia must be pronounced successful. The first chapter (pp. 1-19) treats of the beginnings of Perugia, especially of the famous bronzes of San Mariano, the tomb of San Valentino, the Loeb tripods, and the sarcophagus from Sperandio. The next four chapters are dedicated to the great period of Perugia's history, beginning with the commencement of the fourth century and lasting three hundred years (pp. 20-87). After having spoken about the imposing appearance of the city and its buildings (pp. 20-9) the author attempts to give a picture of public and private life in Perugia (pp. 30-45), especially of its political state, of worship of the gods, and of social life. The third of these four chapters (pp. 46-67) is entitled 'The Necropolises and the Cult of the Dead', the fourth (pp. 68-87) 'Manufacture and Commerce in the Fine Arts'. The last chapter of the book (VI, pp. 88-98) treats of the Romanization and the end of Perugia.

As the author is not a linguistic etruscologist and not an etruscological epigraphist and therefore is forced to give only second-hand information on matters concerning linguistic etruscology and epigraphy, his book is not a first-class source of information on these fields. Thus the statement (p. 32) that there is a general consensus of opinion that the famous Cippus Perusinus (CIE. 4538) relates to a transfer of land is erroneous.

The author regrets (p. ix) that his book cannot contain appendixes useful for a further understanding of Perugia. He intended to give a chronologically arranged table of tombs according to types, a chronological index of all the most important objects, a prosopographia, and a table showing the increasing number of Latin and bilingual inscriptions during the period of Romanization. Let us hope, with the author, that these tables may appear later as a supplement to the present volume.

EMIL GOLDMANN.

Cambridge.

Helen H. TANZER: *The Common People of Pompeii*. A Study of the Graffiti. Pp. xii + 113; 49 photographs and sketches. (The Johns

Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 29.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 14s.

THIS book is excellently produced, well illustrated, fully documented: it has a long bibliography and a full list of inscriptions quoted. Yet the first pages are so carelessly written that the impatient might go no further. The statement that there are a few remains of buildings 'which can be positively dated to the seventh century' is unfounded: to say that 'after 80 B.C. Pompeii was governed by Publius Sulla', that 'it soon grew to be like all the other small Italian towns', and that 'the officers of government were mostly only the little people' suggests little knowledge of conditions in Italy: and the author is prepared to explain the discrepancy in estimates of the population from 25,000 to 50,000 by the fact that the population was greatly augmented at certain seasons by the Romans who used Pompeii for their villeggiatura!

When, however, she comes to her particular study she is much more reliable and interesting. The graffiti throw much light on the life of the common people and deserve this separate treatment. The author classifies the evidence from paintings, scribbles, and more formal writing on the walls: she describes the various trades, spectacles, occupations, and interests of the people in the light of this evidence; quotes fully, and provides a liberal supply of good illustrations clearly explained. This study might have included the business accounts of the auctioneer Caecilius Jucundus: the omission of the less respectable side of life, which is so prominent at Pompeii, was perhaps necessary. A long bibliography is added, but it is too mixed in character to be of great value.

R. MEIGGS.

Balliol College, Oxford.

J. VOGT: *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum*. Studien zum Weltanschauungskampf der Spätantike. Pp. iv+74. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939. Paper, RM. 3.

DESPITE its title, this book is really a review of the

relations between the Jews and the Roman Empire, and of the attitude of pagan philosophers and Christian theologians towards them, from the sack of Jerusalem in A.D. 69 to the times of Julian. The treatment—and the style—is clear and concise. Dr. Vogt keeps in very close touch with the ancient authorities and modern discussions. He provides an excellent, but not overwhelming, running bibliography of standard works and recent articles. In breadth of learning, judgement, and scholarship Dr. Vogt is continually proving himself worthy of the past generation of German scholars.

He points out that the Christian emperors even in their anti-Jewish legislation were always more tolerant than the Christian apologists, whose respect even for the ancient Hebrews steadily degenerated into general enmity, from Origen and Eusebius down to Chrysostom and Zeno of Verona. Meanwhile the pagans, from Celsus onwards, became more friendly. Julian's Neoplatonic teachers regarded Judaism as a form of Hellenism. This Julian accepted, though he did not himself care for the narrowness of Judaism. The anti-Christian motive of Julian's rebuilding of the Temple is then developed on the lines of Bidez, but more fully. The view that the rebuilding was propaganda in preparation for the Persian war in order to detach the Mesopotamian Jews from the Persians is rejected, because Jewish communities did in fact resist Julian. But that only shows that the propaganda was not successful. Vogt must, however, be right in so far as such propaganda was not the dominant motive in Julian's mind. The various accounts of the stopping of the building operations by an earthquake are analysed at perhaps unnecessary length: they show a natural growth of mythological details around an agreed fact. The failure did not much affect the Jews, engrossed in Messianic hopes, but spurred the Christians on to ever bitterer and more successful advocacy of practical anti-Semitism.

This monograph is the very thing for those seeking a clear and sound introduction to a tangled topic.

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, L (1939)

S. Dow, *Aristotle, the Kleroteria and the Courts* (pp. 1-34). Some specimens of kleroteria (allotment machines) have been discovered. A detailed reconstruction of the way in which they were used vindicates *Ath. Pol.* on the allotment of juries, explains why each tribe had two such machines, shows that the word does not mean 'allotment-rooms', and simplifies the ground-plan of the Athenian courts. J. H. Finley, jr., *The Origins of Thucydides' Style* (pp. 35-84). Against Blass, &c., the antithetical style was not the invention of Gorgias, who merely pushed it to its 'illogical conclusion', but had been made familiar at Athens by Protagoras, Prodicus, Thrasymachus, &c. before Gorgias' visit in 427. Thucydides is there-

fore not guilty of anachronism in putting antithetical speeches in the mouths of Pericles and other early orators. A. S. Pease, *Latin Inscriptions in the Virgin Islands* (pp. 85-8). An account of seven privately owned inscriptions. J. Whatmough, *A New Umbrian Inscription of Assisi* (pp. 89-93). A six-word inscription in the Umbrian language and alphabet, dated c. 250 B.C. R. T. Bruère, *The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (pp. 95-122). On the relations of the MSS. A new critical edition is promised.—Summaries of two dissertations.

SYMBOLAE OSLOENSES

XIX (1939)

G. Rudberg, *Das dramatische Element bei Platon* (pp. 1-13). An attempt to establish a parallelism

between the structure of tragedy and that of some of Plato's dialogues. S. Konow, *Ἀναγκαιὸς in an Old Indian Inscription* (p. 14). A transliteration (1st century B.C.) is recognized. R. Philippson, *Die Quelle der epikureischen Götterlehre in Ciceros erstem Buche de Natura Deorum* (pp. 15-40). The source is an epitome written by Philodemus. A. Fridrichsen, *Charité et perfection* (pp. 41-5). A note on Colossians iii. 14: charity binds together the mystical body. E. Skard, *Nemesiosstudien* (pp. 46-56). On the relation of Nemesius to Galen's physiology. S. Eitrem, *Die magischen Gemmen und ihre Weihe* (pp. 57-85). On magical beliefs, the preparation of amulets for use, and a series of magical gems in the National Museum at Copenhagen. G. Björck, *Heidnische und christliche Orakel mit fertigen Antworten* (pp. 86-98). On the use of the lot in various places for selecting an oracular reply from a collection of ready-made answers to more or less stereotyped questions. A. Kurfess, *Ad Oracula Sibyllina* (pp. 99-105). Textual notes. C. A. Trypanis, *The Date of the Pseudo-Hesiodic Ἄσπης* (pp. 106-9). The Homeric hymn to Pythian Apollo imitates the Ἄσπης, which is thus provided with a *terminus ante quem*. E. Vandvik, *Simplex dumtaxat et unum* (pp. 110-17). Notes on Horace: *A.P.* 21 refers to a jar which is partly an *amphora* and partly an *urceus*. H. Mørland, *Sprachliches aus dem zweiten Synopsisbuch der Oribasiusübersetzungen* (pp. 118-23). Annotated list of strange words. L. Amundsen, *Notes to the Brutus of Cicero* (pp. 124-8). (1) The reference at 4, § 16 is to the practice of lending seed to be repaid after the harvest. (2) On 6, § 23. S. Marstrander, *A new Kalós-inscription* (pp. 129-32). On a vase at Oslo. H. Holst, *Numismatica* (pp. 133-4). On a Byzantine gold coin found in Norway. E. Skard, *Zu Sall. Hist. i. 18* (pp. 135-6). On Sallust's pessimism. S. Eitrem, *Varia* (pp. 137-8). Annotations; it is suggested that Hor. *Ep.* 1. i. 90 refers to the boxer's *nodus Herculeus*.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

LXVI. 1 (JANUARY 1940)

J. E. Harry, *Créon et son fils* (Soph. *Ant.* 632): by the familiar *δρα μὴ* Creon expresses his affectionate hope that his son will not be angry with him; *λυσσαίνων* anticipates the real *λύσσα* of Haemon's end. P. Chantraine, *Conjugaison et histoire des verbes signifiant vendre*: the Homeric use of *πέρνημι* shows that it was connected, in thought if not etymologically, with *περᾶν* and meant 'transport and sell'; cf. the various meanings of *πόρος*, and *εμπορος*, 'passenger' as well as 'merchant'. The forms with base *πρα-* are originally passive; the present *πιπράσκομαι* is a secondary formation. *πέρνημι* disappeared along with other verbs in *-νῃμι*, and its place was taken by *πωλέω*, which is really an iterative, 'offer for sale', and hence has no aorist in classical Greek. *ἐπέρᾳσα* succumbed to its likeness to *ἐπέρᾳσα* and was replaced by *ἀπεδόμην*. *ἀποδίδομαι* (passive *πιπράσκομαι*) and *ἀποδώσομαι* (passive *πεπράσομαι*) are required because of the iterative sense of *πωλέω*. In time this was lost and *πωλέω* ousted the other forms, to survive as *Mod. Gk.* *πουλῶ*. *ἐμπολάω* is of doubtful origin, perhaps to be associated with *πέλας*. G. Méautis, *La psychologie de l'Antigone de Sophocle*, argues that Antigone's hesitation when face to face with death is not unnatural. The ancients elsewhere observed the contrast between the ardour of imagination and weakness when reality is at hand. W. Beare, *Contamination in Plautus and Terence*, expands his argument (*C.R.* 1937) that Terence ascribed 'contamination' (in the modern sense) to his predecessors without warrant, and simply to score off his rivals, who could hardly prove the negative. The three cases of 'contamination' allowed by Enk in Plautus (*Rev. Phil.* 1938) can be more plausibly ascribed to free composition. C. Fries, *L'origine de la rhétorique antique*, thinks we should look to the East, and that rhetoric was the 'indispensable weapon of the poor in the social struggle'. P. d'Hérouville, *Matinal ou oriental?*, wishes to translate *matutino* 'oriental' in *Juv.* iv. 108 (*et matutino sudans Crispinus amomo*).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

*** Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Allan (D. J.) Plato: Republic, Book I. Edited by D. J. A. Pp. ix+130. (Methuen's Classical Texts.) London: Methuen, 1940. Cloth, 3s. 6d. (without vocabulary, 3s.).

Argenti (P. P.) Bibliography of Chios from Classical Times to 1936. Pp. xxx+836. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 42s.

Bardino (L.) L'Argenis di John Barclay e il Romanzo Greco. Pp. 127. Palermo: Trimarchi. Paper, L. 15.

Bibliographia Pannonica V. A rómaiakori magyarországi és a népvándorlás kutatásának új irodalma 1939- és 1939-ben. Die neue Literatur über die Römerzeit u. die Epoche der Völker-

wanderung in Ungarn aus den Jahren 1938 u. 1939. Pp. 69. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. I, Fasc. 10.) Budapest: Institut für Münzkunde u. Archäologie der P. Pázmány Universität, 1940. Paper, P. 8 (bound, 10).

Biscardi (A.) Manuissio per mensam e affrancazioni pretorie. Pp. 93. Florence: Le Monnier. Paper, L. 10.

Brommer (P.) ΕΙΔΟΣ et ΙΔΕΑ. Étude sémantique et chronologique des œuvres de Platon. Pp. 277. Assen: van Gorcum, 1940. Paper, fl. 4.90.

Cook (A. B.) Zeus. A study in ancient religion. Vol. III, Part I: Text and notes. Pp. xxix+974; 84 plates, 782 figures. Part II: Appendixes

- and index: pp. 975-1299. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 168s.
- Crum* (W. E.) Coptic Documents in Greek Script. Pp. 25. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXV.) London: Milford. Paper, 3s. 6d.
- D'Allon* (J. F.) Selections from St. John Chrysostom. The Greek Text edited with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. viii+395. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1940. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Davids* (H. L.) De Gnomologieën van Sint Gregorius van Nazianze. Pp. 164. Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1940. Paper, fl. 2.90.
- Delatte* (A.) Anecdota Atheniensia et alia. Tome II. Textes grecs relatifs à l'histoire des sciences. Pp. viii+504. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège—Fasc. LXXXVIII.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1939. Paper.
- Dinsmoor* (W. B.) The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries. Pp. xvi+274. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 30s.
- ΔΠΑΙΜΑ* Martino P. Nilsson a.d. iv id. Iul. MCMXXXIX dedicatum. Pp. xv+656; 95 illustrations. (Skript utg. av Svenska Institutet i Rom, Series Altera, I.) Lund: Gleerup. Paper.
- Frank* (T.) An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Vol. V. Rome and Italy of the Empire. By T. F. Pp. xvi+445. General Index to Vols. I-V. Pp. 140. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, (together) 35s.
- Gallus* (S.) et *Horváth* (T.) Un peuple cavalier préscythique en Hongrie. Trouvailles archéologiques du premier âge du fer et leurs relations avec l'Eurasie. Texte: pp. 165; 10 figures. Planches: 89 plates. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. II. 9.) Budapest: Institut de Numismatique et d'Archéologie de l'Université P. Pázmány, 1939. Paper, P. 40 (bound, 44).
- Giarratano* (C.) Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri. Recensuit C. G. Pp. xvi+317. Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1939. Paper, L. 40.
- Grace* (F. R.) Archaic Sculpture in Boeotia. Pp. viii+86; 83 illustrations. (Harvard-Radcliffe Fine Arts Series.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 26s. 6d.
- Gray* (L. H.) Foundations of Language. Pp. xv+530. New York: The Macmillan Co. (London: Macmillan), 1939. Cloth, 37s. 6d.
- Hesperia*. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IX: No. 2. Pp. 141-260; 63 figures. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1940.
- Hill* (Sir G.) A History of Cyprus. Vol. I. To the Conquest by Richard Lion Heart. Pp. xviii+352; 16 plates, 3 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 25s.
- Klibansky* (R.) The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages. Outlines of a Corpus Platonium Medii Aevi. Pp. 58; 5 plates. London: Warburg Institute, 1939. Cloth.
- Limebeer* (D. E.) The Greeks and the Romans, Part I: The Greeks. Pp. xii+144; 4 plates, 37 figures, 15 maps. Part II: The Romans. Pp. xii+158; 4 plates, 35 figures, 12 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 2s. 9d. each.
- MacLennan* (H.) Oxyrhynchus. An economic and social study. Pp. 93. Princeton, 1935. Stiff paper.
- Moore* (F. G.) Livy, with an English translation, in 13 volumes. VI: Books XXIII-XXV, translated by F. G. M. Pp. x+519; 5 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1940. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Murray* (G.) Aeschylus, the Creator of Tragedy. Pp. xii+242. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Murray* (G.) Stoic, Christian and Humanist. Pp. 189. London: C. A. Watts, 1940. Cloth, 5s.
- Payne* (H.) and others. Perachora. The Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Limenia. Excavations of the British School of Archaeology at Athens 1930-33. Architectures, bronzes, terracottas. Pp. xiv+270; 124 plates, 26 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 84s.
- Percival* (G.) Aristotle on Friendship. An expanded translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Books VIII and IX. Pp. xxxix+151. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Pippidi* (D. M.) Recherches sur le culte impérial. Pp. 205. (Institut roumain d'études latines, Collection scientifique, 2.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres' (Bucarest: Institut roumain).
- Publications de la Société Fouad I de Papyrologie*. Textes et Documents, III. Les Papyrus Fouad I, Nos. 1-89. Pp. xii+253; 8 plates. Cairo: Société Fouad I de Papyrologie, 1939. Paper, P.T. 200.
- Pulling* (J. L.) Barbitos. Experiments in verse-translation. Pp. 131. Melbourne: University Press (London, etc.: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 6s.
- Rouse* (W. H. D.) Nonnos, Dionysiaca, with an English translation by W. H. D. R., mythological introduction and notes by H. J. Rose, and notes on text criticism by L. R. Lind. In 3 volumes. I: Books I-XV; pp. li+533. II: Books XVI-XXXV; pp. xi+547. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1940. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.
- Sbordone* (F.) Hori Apollinis Hieroglyphica. Saggio introduttivo, edizione critica del testo e commento. Pp. lxxxviii+226. Naples: Loffredo. Paper, L. 80.
- Schmidt* (K. L.) Die Polis in Kirche und Welt. Eine lexikographische und exegetische Studie. Pp. viii+111. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Zollikon, 1940. Paper.
- Stam* (J.) Prudentius, Hamartigenia, with introduction, translation, and commentary. Pp. 274. Amsterdam: Paris, 1940. Paper, f. 5.25.
- Tersaghi* (N.) Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni. N. T. recensuit. Pp. xcvi+323. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1939. Paper, L. 55.
- Thompson* (D'A. W.) Science and the Classics. Pp. viii+264. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XLIV.) London: Milford, 1940. Cloth, 5s.
- Todd* (F. A.) Some Ancient Novels. Leucippe and Clitophon, Daphnis and Chloe, The Satiricon, The Golden Ass. Pp. vii+144. London: Milford, 1940. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

s.
l,
d
r.
l,
s-
b
o.
y.
o.
t.
s.
-
a-
ut
l-
s.
-
s,
-
.
l.
s,
s
s
z.
d
o:
r,
-
y
n
ul
s
s.
-
)
r,
a.
e
-
t.
e.
g
-
o.
s.
-
o.
e
i-
: